

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIX.

May, 1913.

No. 5.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS
BALTIMORE

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIX.

May, 1913.

No. 5.

"IN FACIEM EI RESTITI." Gal. ii, 11.

AN EXEGETICAL AND CHARACTER STUDY.

"But when Cephas was come to Antioch, *I withstood him to the face* because he was to be blamed. For before that some came from James, he did eat with the gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And to this dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation.

"But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

Gal. ii, 11, 14.

The written word of God, like "the Word made flesh," is a perpetual "sign of contradiction." The passage to be treated has placed both scholastics and Fathers at variance, but always with such a preponderance of authority on one side that the divisions are often forgotten. Indeed, the relative obscurity whence they issue seems rarely to have exceeded that of the spots on the solar disc. In the world of biblical polemics our text has appeared and vanished, and then re-appeared only to vanish again, almost comet-like. It was the spider web that entangled the Neo-Tübingens and instigated Baur, their founder, to portray fantastic travails in the primitive Church and represent Christianity as a natural conciliatory resultant of con-

tending Petrine and Pauline factions. On this absurdity we need not dwell. The theory lacked the historical evidence necessary to establish the fact. It is the discussion within the pale to which we turn.

I. IDENTITY OF CEPHAS.

Towards the beginning of the third century Clement of Alexandria (d. 217) classified the Cephas here involved with the seventy¹ disciples thereby exonerating the Prince of the apostles.² Over a century and a half later St. John Chrysostom³ patronized a view which St. Jerome ascribes to Origen.⁴ He admitted the identity of Cephas and St. Peter, but added that Cephas and Paul were enacting a little drama amicably agreed upon in advance for the instruction of Christian converts. St. Jerome appeared for a time to commit himself to this opinion, but on being taken to task for it by St. Augustine, who claimed it to be disrespectful and too conniving at artifice and trickery,⁵ he first excused himself by writing: "*ostendi me non ex definito id defendere, . . . sed ea expressisse quae legeram ut lectoris arbitrio derelinquerem, utrum probanda essent, an improbanda.*" (Ref. 4). Eventually he incorporated the more obvious traditional view of his masterful opponent into his Dialogues against the Pelagians.⁶

Clement's distinction between Cephas the apostle and Cephas a disciple seems for an age to have fallen into oblivion. The "Hypotyposes," or work in which it originally appeared never enjoyed great authority and is no longer extant. Without ap-

¹ "Seventy-two." So reads the Vulgate, Lk. x, 1, in accordance with certain Greek texts which enjoy the preference of Weiss. Eusebius, who is undoubtedly following Clement, was evidently influenced by another class of texts reading "seventy." In presence of these last, Westcott and Hort are doubtful about the addition of "two."

² Eus., Hist. Eccl., I, 12 (MPG. xx, 117).

³ Chrys., Hom. II. in Gal., 4 (MPG. lxi, 641).

⁴ Hier., Epis. CXII ad Aug., 4 (MPL. xxii, 918).

⁵ Aug., Epis. XXVIII ad Hier., 3 (MPL. xxxiii, 112).

⁶ Hier., Dial. adv. Pelagianos, I, 22 (MPL. xxiii, 516).

proving the opinion Eusebius recorded it, and an unknown hand formerly believed to be Dorothy of Tyre inserted it into a spurious catalogue of the disciples which was afterwards woven into the Paschal Chronicle.⁷ There it remained for ten centuries as unthought of as the Serapeum before the advent of Mariette.

The rise of Protestantism resuscitated it. The infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff, and of the first Pontiff in particular, seemed in the balance, and Catholics took alarm,—Catholics, indeed, but not all, nor even the larger part, nor the more influential. A few scattered ones here and there raised their voices, but the cry was like an after-glow that gradually dies away.

Pighius (d. 1543) reviewed the opinion as one not to be lightly passed over⁸; Vallarsi (d. 1771) strove to corroborate it with more enthusiasm than logic and historic truth⁹; the Jesuit savant Hardouin (d. 1729) defended it in a posthumous work¹⁰ of such singularity as to find its way into the Index; while other modern writers, less unfortunate in the fate of their works, prepared the way for Aloysio Vincenzi who, as late as 1875, crystallized the view and represented that unless it were held, the doctrine of papal infallibility were doomed.¹¹

If the personal identity of Cephas remained unquestioned from the sixth century to the sixteenth, the sincerity and naturalness of the performers at Antioch were not allowed to enjoy such peace. Peter Lombard, for example, inclined towards the drama interpretation that had long before allured St. Jerome;¹² and the theologian Pighius being like many others of his time

⁷ Chron. Pasch., MPG. xcii, 521.

⁸ Albertus Pighius, *Hierarchiae ecclesiasticae assertio*, iii, ii, Cologne, 1558, 129a-130a. See Vigouroux, *Les Livres Saints et la Critique Rationnaliste*, Paris, 1891, pp. 466-468.

⁹ MPL. xxvi, 339-341, note.

¹⁰ J. Hardouin, *Comm. in N. T. Accedit lucubratio etc.*, Amsterdam, 1741, pp. 785-799.

¹¹ Aloysio Vincenzi, *De Hebraeorum et Christianorum Monarchia*, ed. ii, Rome, 1875, pp. 305 ff.

¹² "Fuit haec reprehensio non vera sed dispensatoria." P. Lomb., in *Gal.*, ii, 14 (MPL. cxcii, 110).

rigidly non-committal, offered it as one of three *possible* solutions of current difficulties. Yet this at best was only precarious support, and Catholic scholars generally stood against it.¹³

Since they are few who have been in sympathy with the drama theory, this explanation may be dismissed in the words of Suarez, as a "frivolous evasion";¹⁴ yet it might not seem fair to discard so peremptorily the Cephas discussion. What was the objective value of the reasons brought to bear against the traditional belief in one Cephas? Dialectics would weigh it at zero, but the reasons held ground too publicly to be treated as phantoms.

The Cephas bubble on the majestic tidal wave of tradition glistened with unenlightened piety united with pride in a noble cause. Alongside the doubt in the minds of scholars as to whether the work of Clement were not marred with Arian interpolations,¹⁵ is the conjecture of Alzog that the "Hypotyposes" were written about the time of the author's conversion from paganism.¹⁶ Then, too, in the light of Eusebius who wrote early in the *fourth* century: *Τῶν δ' ἐβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν, κατάλογος μὲν οὐδεὶς οὐδαμῇ φέρεται*,¹⁷ the Dorothean catalogue in the Paschal Chronicle of the *seventh* century, which presupposes the Clementine view of Cephas, a disciple, dissolves into an unauthentic piece of literature. Du Cange stigmatizes it as the work of "idle Greeks."¹⁸ At any rate, the catalogue would pass more suitably as a list of the personal names contained in the canonical epistles than as a register of our Lord's disciples.

St. Jerome gives us to understand that the shocking blasphemies of Porphyrius were partly responsible for the plausi-

¹³ Among others, St. Thomas in *Gal.* II, lect. 3.

¹⁴ "Frivola evasio a Patribus rejecta." Saurez, *De Legibus*, IX, xv, 7. However, St. John Chrysostom supported the view and was imitated by St. John Damascene (MPG. xc, 787), Oecumenius (MPG. cxviii, 1113), and Theophylactus (MPG. cxxiv, 975).

¹⁵ Vigouroux, *Les Livres Saints*, etc., p. 459, note 2.

¹⁶ Alzog, *Patrologie*, Belet translation, 1877, p. 169.

¹⁷ Eus. *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 12 (MPG. xx, 118).

¹⁸ MPG. xcii, 519, note 95.

bility which the opinion assumed for a time; yet he stoutly maintained that were Porphyrius to be heeded, many another passage "blackened by him through ignorance" would have to be severed from Holy Writ.¹⁹ It was not that St. Jerome underrated the primacy. Quite the contrary, he was one of its staunch adherents, but he was satisfied with it as Christ had made and left it. He refused to be moved by the foolish fears of those who would improve upon it by giving it a head of gold, but feet of clay, because they felt it must be somewhat of a failure if reproach of any kind could be levelled against it.

Purposely passing over the apocryphal letter of St. Martial to the people of Toulouse, a writing that lays claim to first century origin, although its author quotes Holy Scripture according to a version not known until the fourth,²⁰ one is justified in saying that the arena of Christian apologetics in the first six centuries would hardly have attained renown, had no other contest arisen on its sands. Offsetting a meagre skepticism so weakly voiced, there was harmony and moral unanimity among the Fathers of the period. "Mihi Cephas amicus, sed magis amica veritas" was the prevailing sentiment, and doctors like St. Clement of Rome, Sts. Irenaeus and Cyprian, Tertullian, Sts. John Chrysostom, Jerome, and others²¹ down to St. Gregory the Great (d. 604)²² were firm representatives of a traditionary belief in only one Cephas.

Enthusiasm and a larger following characterized the outburst occasioned by the Reformation, yet "honor to whom honor is due!" An examination of the view as set forth afresh brings to light three undesirable qualities either in the defendants

¹⁹ Hier., in *Gal.*, II, 11 (MPL. XXVI., 341).

²⁰ The criticism is that of Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccl.*, sæc. I. xii, II, Paris, 1714, iii, 47.

²¹ Clem. I *Epis. ad Cor.*, XLVII; Iren., *Contra Haer.*, III, xii, 15; Cypr., *Epis.* LXXI, 3. See MPG. I, 308; VII, 910; and IV, 410, respectively. St. Chrys., *ad loc.*, takes the identity for granted.

²² "Sunt vero nonnulli qui non Petrum apostolorum principem, sed quemdam alium eo nomine qui a Paulo sit reprehensus accipiunt. Qui si Pauli studiosius verba legissent, ista non dicerent." Hom. in *Ezech.* II, hom. VI, 10 (MPL. LXXVI, 1003).

or their methods. They are exaggeration, idiosyncrasy, paradox.²³

For example, the strongest line of argument to which Hardouin resorted was the following. In the epistle to the Galatians, as read in the Vulgate, two names, Cephas and Peter, occur. The Vulgate, in having been pronounced authentic by the Council of Trent, bespeaks through this distinction of names a necessary distinction of persons.—Therein lay exaggeration, for Peter and Cephas are but Græco-Latin and Aramaic forms of the same name.

That was the only new argument advanced by Hardouin, and before presenting it he had forfeited his right to an independent hearing, by accepting and re-casting, without analyzing or verifying, a historical defense volunteered by Vallarsi. Vallarsi had in turn cited as favoring the view three Fathers who were manifestly opposed to it, namely, Sts. John Chrysostom, Jerome and Gregory the Great; and he had thought to clinch his proof by denying that St. Péter was at Antioch when St. Paul resisted Cephas.—The last part of this premise is as gratuitous as the first part is untrue.

Vincenzi seems thoroughly alarmed. For him, the dogma of papal infallibility is fatally undermined if Cephas was the head of the Church. But in order to save St. Peter, he deposes not only Cephas, but also James and John who are mentioned with him in Gal. ii, 9. This summary procedure reduces the three grand personages whom St. Paul honored as "pillars of the church" to a level inferior to that of the least of the apostles.

Needless to say, modern and contemporary theologians of note ²⁴ take sides with the Fathers, and with them the scholas-

²³ Not having at hand the works of Pighius or Hardouin, the former of whom ranked high as an apologist in the Reformation period, we here rely on Vigouroux who summarizes without alteration the excellent study of Pesch, *über die Person des Kephais in the Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, VII, 1883, pp. 456-490 (Ref. 8).

²⁴ Among them are Bellarmine, Salmeron, Estius, Tirin, Calmet, Windischmann, Reithmayr, Bacquez, Vigouroux, as against such names as Camerarius, (d. 1564), Carriero (d. 1726), Girolamo Constantini, etc.

tics, who, as a body, practically ignored the ancient differences, are tightly phalanxed. The identity of Cephas, therefore, as Prince of the apostles may be ranked with those historical facts which, although doubted by some, are not on that account doubtful.

Our text need not be subjected to very critical investigation to show that St. Paul's energetic action was directed towards a person of influence, one whose example was so powerful as to lead the apostle Barnabas "into dissimulation," one who could not act unbecomingly with impunity. The Vulgate conveys the idea that Cephas was "to be blamed," that is, in St. Paul's estimation. The Greek reading is stronger, for it is to the effect that he actually "was blamed," κατεγνωσμένος ἦν, as it were, by the gentile converts. St. Chrysostom entertains no doubt about the latter interpretation, for he comments: οὐκ εἶπεν, ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ', ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων (Ref. 3). Cephas must then have been in high station, else, why was his conduct so heeded? He was more. He is reproached by St. Paul as one who either directly or indirectly has authority "to compel the gentiles" into determinate modes of living and one who has made a bad use of that authority.

To this much gleaned from the internal character of the text, more is added from its peculiar setting and from the trend of the whole epistle. The apostle's rhetoric is unsurpassed. He has a contest to win for the crucified Christ, and he is prepared to wrestle, if need be, with "an angel from heaven," rather than yield a jot or tittle of the "revelation" he has received. "*Though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.*"²⁵ It is not contrast but climax that rings in these clear tones, and the generic "we" is a powerful allusion to the rôles of Cephas and Barnabas who among others were associated with Paul in a ministry that no created authority might rescind. As if implying that the faithful Galatians

²⁵ Gal. i, 8.

would be shocked on hearing of the collision with Cephas, the apostle arms their minds beforehand against disturbance by the warning that resistance to an angel would be justifiable under the circumstances. Assuredly, it is no ordinary disciple who is antagonised.

This idea is emphasized by a glance at the report which St. Paul volunteers of his deportment at the beginning of his mission. He was from the first respectful of authority, and without the approval of authority he did not presume to preach. This he inculcates at length by relating a particular errand he had undertaken to Jerusalem through obedience to "revelation," in order to confer "with them who seemed to be something" concerning the "gospel" he was preaching among the gentiles. Such was the test to which he submitted his personal revelations, assigning as his reason: "lest I should run or had run in vain."²⁶ Now they who "seemed to be something" were the "pillars" of Gal. ii, 9, namely, James and Cephas and John. The two-fold outcome of the conference with them was that "the gospel" of St. Paul was approved without alteration and his vocation to the gentile ministry was officially recognized and confirmed.

It is directly after this prelude that the dissension at Antioch is introduced with the adversative, "*but.*" Evidently, the narrative that follows is to be contrasted in some way with what precedes, and so it is. A Cephas is antagonized, and since he is in no way distinguished from "the pillar of the church" who had previously endorsed the mission and policy of St. Paul, it is illogical to identify him with any other.

It is the custom of New Testament writers to designate individuals descriptively or otherwise whenever there is a possibility of confounding two or more contemporaries bearing the same name. Thus, St. Luke speaks of John, "the son of Zachary,"²⁷ and St. Matthew of John "the Baptist," thereby distinguishing the forerunner from another whom St. Matthew styles "the brother of James, the son of Zebedee."²⁸ And in turn, this James "of Zebedee" is distinguished from James

²⁶ Gal. ii, 2.

²⁷ Lk. iii, 2.

²⁸ Mtt. iii, 1; xi, 2; xvi, 14, etc.

"of Alphaeus"; ²⁹ Mary, "the mother of the Lord," from Mary Magdalene, and these two from Mary "of James"; ³⁰ Paulus Sergius from Paul the apostle, and so on. But there is no clew given in any part of the New Testament to a second Cephas.

Add to this that Aramaic usage stood, negatively at least, against such a possibility. As far as can be learned, Cephas ³¹ was neither used nor accepted as a proper name until our Lord introduced it, and the rare significance with which He endowed it was such as to make it antecedently improbable that He would confer it more than once. What is that but to say that the patristic view, is, as usual, thoroughly scientific!

II. THE CONTROVERSY.

The controversy *about* the passage is only a faint glimmer of the controversy *in* the passage. The latter was a vital issue calculated, if wrongly solved, to stunt the growth of Christianity prematurely. It was not so much that St. Paul was against St. Peter, as that St. Peter stood in practice on a given occasion against what he himself approved and professed in belief. It was because he was pusillanimous and vacillating at a critical juncture that St. Paul remonstrated with him.

To fill up the bones of this meagre description with flesh, it will be helpful to take the performers aside and interrogate them one by one as to the ideas, convictions and experiences dictating their conduct. Then we shall be in a position to appreciate the scene enacted before us, and by imbuing it with life we shall realize the high moral lesson it imparts, and the purpose it is made to serve in the epistle to the Galatians.

In the description with which this paper begins, there is mention of four individuals and two groups. The individuals are Paul and Barnabas, Cephas and James. The groups are gentiles and Jews. Since the individuals collided merely through the sympathy they fostered for the groups, we shall

²⁹ Mtt. x, 3; Acts, i, 13.

³⁰ Mtt. xxvii, 56.

³¹ כֶּפֶס, a rock.

better understand them by placing them on the background of the groups.

The gentiles were apparently in peaceful control at Antioch. Jews there were among them, for how could such a commercial people be absent from the third most important city of the empire?³² Yet they were Jews of the Diaspora, broadminded subjects, who from constantly mingling with the heathen had long since parted with much of the rigidity and conventionality that hedged about Jerusalem orthodoxy. Even before their conversion they had been obliged to cede first one point of the Law and then another until there were scarcely any rabbinical observances left practicable for them, save circumcision with abstention from unclean foods and from intermarriage with the gentiles. Even these were hard and circumcision caused them often to be despised.³³

When the gospel was preached they began to breathe an air of fullest liberty. They learned from it truth, such truth as made them free. Residing among a vigorous people with whom they would fain associate but could not, except as necessity required, they suddenly beheld the last barrier of separation razed to the ground. Legal observance was to be superseded by faith in the Christ of whom the prophets had taught and written.

The first seeds of the new doctrine had been brought to Antioch through the synagogue, but they lay buried in the hearts of a few until after the martyrdom of St. Stephen. Then they marvellously sprang up, as it were, in a night. The Christian witnesses of the heroic death of the protomartyr, in fleeing from the persecution that followed it, were emboldened to break away from the traditional claims of the Sanhedrists, its instigators, and going north as far as Antioch, they took the initiative of "preaching also to the Greeks." This novel

³² Josephus describes Antioch as "the third city of the habitable earth . . . under Roman rule, both in magnitude, and other marks of prosperity." Wars, III, ii, 4. Whiston's trans., p. 712.

³³ See Fouard, St. Paul and His Missions, III, Griffith's trans., New York, 1894, p. 57.

proceeding produced fruits so remarkable that the "great number" of converts created a stir even at Jerusalem, and a special envoy, Barnabas, was dispatched to visit them. An increasing multitude was rapidly "added to the Lord," for the Antiochians were moved by this "good man," and it was not long until "a church" had been founded among them. Never before had there been such indiscriminate mingling of gentile with Jew on religious matters, and as a result of this singularity operating on a grand and brilliant scale, the populace coined a new term to characterize it. It was at Antioch "the disciples were first called Christians."³⁴

With such an origin the spirit of "the mother of the gentile churches" can easily be imagined. Never for a moment, even when most flourishing, was there thought of severing its relations with Jerusalem, "the mother of all the churches." Submission to Barnabas in his official capacity meant submission to Jerusalem, and the fact that later on the prediction of Agabus, a prophet from the Holy City, was heeded and acted upon by the forwarding of famine-funds "to the brethren who dwelt in Judea," is sufficient proof that the nascent community considered itself one in heart and spirit with that which begot it.³⁵

Peace was soon disturbed, however, for towards the close of St. Paul's first missionary journey, A. D. 49, "some coming down from Judea, taught the brethren: that except you be circumcised after the manner of Moses, you cannot be saved." Once more Antioch bowed to Jerusalem and awaited thence a decision of what St. Luke describes as having been "no small contest." The verdict of the first Church council was favorable to the gentiles, it seeming good "to the Holy Ghost and to them," to impose no further obligations on the new converts than that they should refrain from "things sacrificed to idols, from blood, from things strangled and from fornication."³⁶

A loophole for further anxiety and contention was left in this legislation since it affected, not all Christians, but only "the brethren of the gentiles," *i. e.*, converts from paganism.

³⁴ Acts, XI, 20-26.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 27-30.

³⁶ Acts, xv, 1-29.

For the Jerusalem kindred there had never been any doubt about the plausibility of observing the Law of Moses and that of Christ together. Had Christ not come to perfect rather than to destroy?³⁷ Could not the disciple of Christ be the ideal follower of Moses? Worship in the temple, circumcision, abhorrence of unclean foods,—all these were practices quite compatible with Christianity, and were noteworthy ingredients of the atmosphere in which originated that admirable piece of apologetics known as St. Matthew's gospel. It is Jerusalem environment that St. James at a later date so graphically depicts in the Acts of the Apostles. Addressing St. Paul he says: "Thou seest, brother, how many *thousands* (*μυριάδες*) there are among the Jews that have believed, and they are *all* zealous for the (Mosaic) law."³⁸ The Antiochian Jews had as a class broken loose from this captivating traditionalism, or, if any were still drawn towards it, it was in an extremely modified form.

Yet all can call to mind a feverish movement of the age, one that our Lord rebuked most sharply because of the alarming proportions of its abuse in His day. It was that of the Scribes and Pharisees who would "go round about the sea and the land to make one proselyte and then make him a child of hell" twofold worse than themselves.³⁹ There was an infiltration of this tendency into the infant Church. Side by side with the healthful proselytism exercised by the apostles, others, "false brethren,"⁴⁰ were doing their best to propagate a Judaeo-Christianity binding upon all. They remembered that in the days of John Hyrcan, the Idumeans had been converted into full-fledged Jews by submitting to circumcision; that Aristobulus had in like manner subjugated the Itureans. Peter, James and John,—all whom they knew at Jerusalem, were still observing the Law. Why, therefore, should the gentiles be exempt? The decision of the Jerusalem council failed to daunt them. If circumcision had been pronounced unnecessary for salvation, it did not become for that reason, unnecessary

³⁷ Mtt. v, 17.

³⁸ Mtt. xxiii, 15.

³⁹ Acts, xxi, 20.

⁴⁰ Gal. ii, 4.

for Christian perfection. In other words, the Law-abiding Jew was superior to his uncircumcised gentile brother, even within the Church.

This climax had not been reached at the time of the Antiochian episode, but St. Paul must have seen it evolving, and this keen foresight accounts for his bold and significant stand against St. Peter. Subsequently, when writing to the Galatians, he realized that the cockle had been sown, had stealthily grown up, and was spreading from Syria into Asia Minor. Then with all the energy of his noble soul, he relates the dissension of Antioch in defence of himself and his divinely sanctioned authority, against those who had "bewitched" the Galatians into thinking that he was personally and in teaching, adverse to the other apostles. The gist of the story lies, not in his resistance to Peter, but in Peter's humble acquiescence, which, as the context shows, is left to be understood. What Theophylactus says is to the point: "*Neque enim quidquam Petrus contradicit; unde planum est, quod oppositionem Pauli aequo animo susceperit*" (Ref. 14).

The rôles of Sts. Peter, Paul and Barnabas at Antioch cannot be duly appreciated if dislodged from this perspective, yet their importance will grow more manifest by a closer study of the individuals.

Barnabas was the divinely enlightened man who, "filled with the Holy Ghost," had been an inspiration to the community at Antioch from the moment of his first appearance at the metropolis (about A. D. 41). He it was, who, at Lycaonia, perhaps for his tall, imposing and venerable appearance, was mistaken by uncultured inlanders for Jupiter.⁴¹ He was a man of energy, a Levite of Cyprian origin, and if Eusebius be right, one of the seventy disciples. The name he bore, signifying "son of consolation,"⁴² had been bestowed upon him by the apostles as a token of gratitude for his liberality. His influence began at Jerusalem; it grew strong at Antioch. At the former city he had without much difficulty introduced the fiery convert

⁴¹ Acts, XIV, 12.

⁴² Acts, IV, 36.

Saul into the confidence of the apostles; while in the latter he advanced him to headship over the heterogeneous flock in company with himself. Saul and he grew into friends so thoroughly co-operative in their efforts for church-extension as to merit a special vocation from the Holy Spirit for foreign missions.⁴³ As a consequence they thenceforth ranked with "the twelve" and were styled apostles.

Although Saul, or St. Paul, as we here prefer to call him, was indebted to Barnabas for his influential position at Antioch, he was not on that account a mere parasite. He was naturally high-strung, and had much to be proud of in origin, birthplace, education, character, citizenship and religion. Fearlessly he proclaimed his blamelessness under the Law and his personal superiority over contemporaries through zealous adhesion to the "traditions of the fathers." But from all this there came a moment when he had to break away; and, as he himself tells it, "when it pleased him who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace to reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the gentiles, immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood."⁴⁴

St. Paul was a man of principle, of high purpose and sturdy resolution, whose whole being had been transformed and supernaturalized at a time when he was trying hardest "to kick against the goad."⁴⁵ What had wrought the change? A lightning-flash and a voice, the voice of Jesus of Nazareth. From that moment the apostle was ruled by one idea, guided by one light, the light "that enlighteneth every man," yet in no soul did that light shine so brilliantly as in his own. "Jesus Christ yesterday, to-day, and the same forever"⁴⁶ became his watchword. For him Christ was "a revelation" direct and unmistakable, for which he had divine assurance, and that revelation eventually effected the thrilling conquest of a noble self. Of Christ he became "the slave."⁴⁷

If St. Paul needed the good offices of St. Barnabas to draw

⁴³ *Ibid.*, XIII, 2.

⁴⁴ Gal. I, 13-16.

⁴⁵ Acts, IX, 5; XXVI, 14.

⁴⁶ Hebr. XIII, 8.

⁴⁷ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος. Gal. I, 10.

him from his home retreat at Tarsus, he was nevertheless persuaded that it was a special operation of divine grace that had so thoroughly metamorphosed him as to make him of the slightest service to Barnabas, and through him to Christ. His intense mental activity was habitually steadied by the knowledge that constant strenuous effort was indispensable to keep him from becoming a "castaway,"⁴⁸ and that he was "the least of the apostles," or, at that early period, vastly inferior to the apostles because he had "persecuted the church of God." "By the grace of God," he insists, "I am what I am, and his grace in me hath not been void."⁴⁹ Yet for all that he was not ungrateful to his colleague. He would labor for the cause in union with Barnabas, he would allow Barnabas precedence in rank and dignity, placing himself last among the lesser prophets and doctors of Antioch:⁵⁰ but let Barnabas or another, whether of heaven or earth, interfere with the due discharge of his sacred ministry, or put a damper on it, and at once he was prepared to dissent, and to depart, and to anathematize, and without a tear of repentance to publish wherever he went the unpleasant encounters and the abandonment of friends to which his zeal for Christ had impelled him.

How different were Sts. Peter and James! The latter, although related to Christ, seems never to have diminished in sympathy for his fellow countrymen or in zeal for the Law. However liberal may have been the views he voiced at the Jerusalem council, his entire life was such as to merit for him the title of "the Just" from Christian and non-Christian Jews alike. He must then have fulfilled the Mosaic requirements for personal justice in the episcopal office which he began to fill about ten years after the ascension. He was to all an example of austerity and asceticism. Hegesippus describes him as a Nazarite.⁵¹ Owing to the steadfastness with which he clung to Jewish customs, if not also to a ponderous and

⁴⁸ 1 Cor. ix, 27.

⁴⁹ 1 Cor. xv, 10.

⁵⁰ See Acts, xii, 25 and xiii, 1.

⁵¹ Hegesippus (c. A. D. 160). See Eus., Hist. Eccl., ii, 23 (MPG. xx, 196).

imperturbable personal authority, James's safety was secure in very troublous times.⁵²

Among the inspired writings, an address by him in the Acts of the Apostles,⁵³ with the epistle that bears his name affords us the best insight into his mental equipment and conservatism. Meagre and scarcely varying in his written and spoken vocabulary, he appears less removed from Old Testament ideas and traditionary ways of thinking than any other New Testament writer. In this respect he is the antithesis of St. Paul, though in no wise his adversary.

And St. Peter. If St. James had at the council given utterance to broadening views relative to the duties of gentile converts, he had St. Peter to thank for it, while St. Peter could thank only the Lord.

The Jerusalem atmosphere, incarnate with legalism and the temple cult, was not naturally suited to the spread of evangelical liberty. Even the great Paul was not always immune from its narrowing influence. But as a miracle was deigned for the conversion of Paul, so a vision was accorded for the enlightenment of Peter. The mysterious linen sheet let down by the four corners from heaven, "wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts, and creeping things of the earth, and fowls of the air," caused a revolting sensation in the breast of the hungering apostle. And when a voice from heaven bade him "Arise, kill and eat," he tremblingly answered: "Far be it from me, for I never did eat anything that is common and unclean." "That which God has cleansed," said the voice, "do not thou call common." The vision was repeated three times, and Peter on the morrow, as a result of it, privately inaugurated the gentile movement by admitting Cornelius and his family into the Church. He had learned by this special revelation that not

⁵²His martyrdom by stoning is ascribed by Josephus to the personal malice of Ananus, not to popular sentiment. As a consequence, Ananus was deposed from the high-priesthood at the demands of the more respected and influential citizens. *Antiq.*, xx, ix, 1. Whiston's trans., pp. 598-599.

⁵³*Acts*, xv, 13-29.

in Judea alone, "but in every nation, whoever feareth God and worketh justice is acceptable to God."⁵⁴

Not all hearts were touched as was St. Peter's. The Jerusalem community, so edifying and ideal in its earlier days, was wroth. "Why didst thou go in to men uncircumcised?" they asked, and why "didst thou eat with them?" "The spirit said to me that I should go, nothing doubting," was the reply. Thereupon they "held their peace and glorified God."⁵⁵

This charming little incident meant more for primitive Christianity than we can readily imagine. It converted Peter and through him the Jerusalem brethren including St. James; it prepared for the subsequent reception of St. Paul who would not presume to preach until his "gospel" was approved by the Jerusalem authorities: it made the enactments of the first council a possibility, and their enforcement and defence a legitimate reality in a very short time,—but it did not remove St. Peter's natural limitations.

He who through pusillanimity had thrice denied the Lord,—he who when wishing to do his best, had deserved to be called a satan (adversary) by the Master himself,—he who had laid himself open to public reprehension by mutilating with the sword at Gethsemane, though no other mode of defence seemed practicable,—such a one could hardly be expected to grasp the new situation in all its phases and act with the precision of a casuist in every new combination of circumstances.

On visiting Antioch after the liberal views of the council had been promulgated, St. Peter enjoyed perfect security in his daily associations with the gentiles. He availed himself of their privileges, lived with them, ate with them, became one of them, as he had hitherto done in the house of Cornelius, but suddenly affairs took an unexpected change. Certain ones "came from James," Judaizers, quite naturally, who are described as being "of the circumcision"; and when they were come, Peter withdrew and separated himself from the gentiles, "fearing" the new arrivals. It was not the time for one in

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, x, 10-35.

⁵⁵ Acts, xi, 3-18.

authority to fear. Cephas, at least in St. Paul's estimation, should have conducted himself as freely, independently and vigorously on that occasion as he had previously in defending his course with the household of Cornelius. In the latter instance he had openly withstood the Jerusalem Jews after having been assailed by them, and he was honored for it; but now, before any recorded protest, he "*feared*" and acted otherwise. St. Paul styles his present policy one of "dissimulation." The immediate effect was deplorable. "The rest of the Jews consented" to him so that Barnabas too, the influential head of the community, was drawn on with them. The force of example was so embarrassing that the gentiles felt "compelled" by it. Otherwise, St. Paul's remonstrance is unintelligible.

"When I saw," he says, "that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: 'If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou (now) *compel* the gentiles to live as do the Jews?'" ⁵⁸

The import of Peter's action was an unwitting admission of Judaizing supremacy and the virtual enslaving of pagan converts to Jewish prejudice. The work of enfranchisement so nobly begun at the council was, for the time being, compromised.

However, Cephas *did not teach* what he acted. He is not accused of false doctrine. He merely failed "*to walk*" according to the truth he professed. His error is called by the same name, *ὑπόκρισις*, as that of the scribes and Pharisees in Matt. xxiii, where there is question, not of teaching, but of definite modes of conduct that give the lie to approved teaching. Barnabas and the Antiochian Jews were spontaneously drawn, but were not obliged to imitate him, much less to hold up his example as imposing itself on others. And who knows if Peter were not also drawn to acquit himself thus by the respect he still cherished for James? The recollection of the remarkable ascetic, his austere demeanor and penitential life were yet fresh in his mind. The reverential awe in which St. James was held by the Jerusalem populace led St. Peter to almost envy

⁵⁸ Gal., ii, 14.

him. Then too he had only recently left him, and would it not appear strange if those now come "*from James*" were so soon to return with reports of precocious laxity in the very Prince of the apostles? It is true that the enactments of the council had been formulated and ratified by Peter and James conjointly, but, as has been already observed, the new prescriptions were addressed to gentile converts and not to those "of the circumcision." Peter belonged to the latter class.

There is nothing unorthodox in the admission that St. Peter sinned, since St. Thomas held that opinion; yet the text hardly imposes the admission. In the statement, "*verum est quod Petrus peccavit*," St. Thomas is obviously following St. Augustine who bases his view on the Latin term "*reprehensibilis*," which perhaps ought more correctly to be rendered "*reprehensus*," as elsewhere observed.⁵⁷

St. Peter's apparent "*dissimulation*" was intended *to edify* the visiting Jews, and might have had the merit of positive virtue because of its unquestionable albeit unenlightened sincerity. Hence with Peter Lombard we prefer to think that "*nec Petrus peccavit, nec Paulus procaciter arguit*" (Ref. 12). The "*fear*" actuating Cephas was, according to St. Thomas, a "*timor caritatis, ne, scilicet scandalizarentur (Judaei), sicut dicitur in Glossa.*"⁵⁸ But on the other hand, "*nimiam diligentiam adhibebat, ne scandalizaret Judaeos, ita quod ex hoc sequeretur gentilium scandalum.*"⁵⁹ This notwithstanding, St. Paul was void of sympathy for virtue of the sort under the circumstances. *He* had not yet fallen under the influence of James; he had not allowed his convictions to be subdued even by Barnabas: he had been born to lead and not to follow. His vocation was both personal and revealed, while subjection to Cephas had been imposed upon him only as a safeguard. Hence, if Paul was subordinate to Peter in this respect, Peter on his side had the obligations of a superior whose duty it was "to

⁵⁷ Summa, 1-2, ciii, iv, ad 2m.

⁵⁸ Expos. in Epis. ad Gal. Cap. ii, lect. iii.

⁵⁹ Summa, 1-2, ciii, iv, ad 2m.

walk uprightly *according to the truth of the gospel.*" It was because he failed in this that Paul, his subject, blamed him.

Among a series of beautiful articles relating to fraternal correction St. Thomas introduces one entitled "*Utrum quis teneatur corrigere praelatum suum.*" Its import is in the affirmative, for fraternal correction, being an act of charity, should extend to all with whom we are united in the bonds of charity. Yet when the occasion arises, the prelate should be treated without petulance or harshness, and with mildness and reverence. A synthetic master-mind like St. Thomas's could not overlook a passage like ours in treating a subject of the kind. Confronted by it he adds to his main thesis the observation that *whenever the interests of the faith are endangered*, prelates should be reproved even *publicly* by their subordinates. In voicing this principle he appeals to the Glossa Augustini which says: "Peter himself set an example to those in authority, that should they perchance abandon the right path, they might not disdain to be corrected by their inferiors."⁶⁰

St. Paul was beginning a career of polemics in action. Humanly speaking, he was of too strong a character, too independent and aggressive, to elicit for any great length of time warm personal sympathy or even notable encouragement from his early Christian friendships. His connections with Barnabas were soon disrupted by a dissension over the latter's attachment to John Mark, one whose companionship, although desirable from a material standpoint, would have had a dampening effect on the apostle's zeal. Indeed, the recollection of "the pillars" of the church was so be-dimmed in the mind of Paul, that he seems at an early period not to have preserved any sentiment of personal obligation towards them. "To me," he writes, "they that seemed to be something, (namely, Cephas, James and John) *added nothing.*"⁶¹

It was the defunct Mosaic Law with its iron grasp on the Jewish mind that was responsible for the current of ideas so detrimental to Church expansion. Hence, the doctrine devel-

⁶⁰ Summa, 2-2, xxxiii, iv, ad 2m.

⁶¹ Gal. ii, 6.

oped all through the epistle to the Galatians is to the effect that the Law was never more than "a pedagogue" leading to Christ "through faith," and that faith being come, "we are no longer under a pedagogue." ⁶² "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision: but faith that worketh by charity." St. Paul was circumcised but unlike the Judaizing proselytizers, he would not glory on that account. He feared lest he should make void "the scandal of the cross," the only genuine "glory" he would recognize. On the contrary, he preached that "every man circumcising himself" after the abolition of the Law, would, if consistent, make himself "a debtor to do the whole Law," and would be "fallen from grace." ⁶³

At this point our study might be dismissed, were it not for a policy subsequently pursued by St. Paul at Jerusalem when he too fell under the influence of James. If St. Peter saw in Paul's epistles "certain things hard to be understood," ⁶⁴ St. James was confronted by much of the same character in the reports afloat about him. When St. Paul's life was in jeopardy, the worthy bishop-saint was desirous to exculpate him by having him submit publicly in company with others and within the temple precincts to the performance of a Nazarite vow. He was to show thereby that "the things heard about him were false," and that Paul walked in a manner worthy of the Jerusalemites,—"*keeping the Law!*" The motive assigned was the avoidance of scandal among the "many thousands" of Jews in the Holy City who believed and were all "*zealous for the Law.*" ⁶⁵ A like motive had actuated Peter at Antioch, but St. Paul, who had magnanimously withstood Peter, was unable to cope with the authority of the sturdier patriarch James. He consented, and by so doing he furnishes us with one more reason for sympathizing with vacillating Cephas. Nay, humanly speaking, he almost plunges us into wonderment as to

⁶² *Ibid.*, III, 24, 25.

⁶³ II Pet., III, 16.

⁶⁴ Gal., v, 2-6.

⁶⁵ Acts, XXI, 20-24.

whether primitive Christianity could have survived if Jerusalem and its temple had been spared, if the primacy had not been removed, or if the native Christian populace had not been providentially torn up by the roots, and mercifully transplanted to a foreign soil to die as martyrs—in exile.

THOMAS À K. REILLY, O. P.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

MITHRAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

From the survey of Mithraism given in the last issue of the *Bulletin*, it is easy to see that in several respects this oriental cult fell far short of the Christian religion. Its chief object of worship was a mythical deity, identified with the sun; it encouraged propitiatory offerings to the spirit of evil; it violated the sense of religious propriety in its grotesque rites; it fostered the baneful superstitions of astrology; it did not scruple to ally itself closely with rival cults whose moral worth was not of a high grade.

And this brings us to the question of the value of Mithraism as a guide to monotheistic belief and practise. Many writers speak of it as if it were a monotheistic religion. But its monotheism, like that of Isis, like that of the Palmyrian sun-god set up with much pomp and splendor by Aurelian in 273 A. D., was little more than an empty name. Ancient Mazdaism was a very close approach to monotheism and united to a high ethical teaching an uncompromising loyalty to the supreme god, Ormazd. It formed no unholy alliances with foreign pagan cults. It was as stern towards false gods as Christianity itself. But the same cannot be said of Mithraism, which was penetrated through and through with the syncretism of the age. Mithra was no jealous god, demanding whole-hearted and exclusive service. To become a Mithraist one did not have to renounce the worship of other gods. One remained the polytheist he was before, with a new god and a new form of worship added to his list of religious diversions. The proofs of this are abundant. Commodus was initiated not only in the mysteries of Mithra but in the Eleusinian mysteries as well. He was also a worshipper of Isis, and did not disdain to carry the statue of Anubis in procession, clad in a white linen robe. A slave, Apronianus, restores a ruined temple of Mithra and

also builds one to Isis.¹ Aurelius Decimus, governor of Numidia (283-284) dedicates an altar to Jove, Juno, Minerva, to the sun Mithra, and other deities.² In this slough of polytheism the very leaders of Mithraism are hopelessly mired. One inscription records the dedication of an altar to Cybele and Attis by Caelius Hilarianus, who is a priest, not only of Mithra, but also of the god Liber and of the goddess Hekate.³ Another records the gift of an altar to Cybele and Attis by Ulpius Egnatius Faventinus, a Roman augur, at the same time priest of Mithra, archpriest of Liber, hierophant of Hekate, priest of Isis, and a recipient of the taurobolium.⁴ Numerous other instances may be found in Cumont's rich collection of Mithraic inscriptions.⁵ Between this so-called monotheism of Mithra-worship and that of the Christian religion there is a gulf as wide as that which separates earth from heaven. One is justified in asking whether after all a high place should be accorded to a religion that by intimate association with other pagan cults fostered and helped to perpetuate the grossest errors and the darkest superstitions. Cumont, in his *Mysteries of Mithra*, p. 198, recognizes this grave defect of Mithraism. He says:—"As the Church grew in power despite its persecutors, this policy of compromise first assured to Mithraism much tolerance, and afterward even the favor of the public authorities. But it also prevented it from freeing itself of the gross and ridiculous superstitions which complicated its ritual and its theology; it involved it, in spite of its austerity, in an equivocal alliance with the orgiastic cult of the beloved of Attis; and it compelled it to carry the entire weight of a chimerical and odious

¹ *Textes et Mon.*, II, p. 120, no. 152.

² *Ibid.*, p. 168, no. 529.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 96, no. 19.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 96, no. 20.

⁵ The worship of Jupiter Dolichenus, imported by soldiers from Com-magene, was also closely associated with Mithraic worship. At Carnuntum, the temples of both gods stood side by side. At Hedderheim, Wiesbaden, and Grosskrotzenburg, altars and sculptured remains of Dolichene and of Mithraic worship were found mingled together. Cf. Wolff, *op. cit.*, p. 11. In the Mithraic temples along the Rhine statues of local deities were given places of honor.

past. If Romanized Mazdaism had triumphed, it would not only have preserved from oblivion all the aberrations of pagan mysticism, but would also have perpetuated the erroneous doctrine of physics on which its dogmatism reposed. The Christian doctrine, which broke with the cults of nature, remained exempt from these impure associations, and its liberation from every compromising attachment assured it an immense superiority."

The practise of charity towards the needy and distressed has been from the very beginning a distinguishing mark of the Church of Christ. In this important feature of religious activity the Church was without a rival. Neither in Mithraism nor in any other of the oriental cults do we find an exception to the general pagan apathy towards suffering humanity. Such beneficence as it exercised seems to have been limited to its initiates, all of whom were, so to speak, paying members. The small community of secret worshippers grouped about each temple formed itself into a society or corporation recognized by law, with its legalized board of trustees elected by the members. A treasury was maintained by initiation fees, regular contributions from members and by extraordinary donations from wealthy patrons, some of whom were not initiates themselves. By this means each Mithraic community doubtless served as a mutual benefit society, giving aid to its members in distress, and providing at death for a proper funeral.⁶ But there is no reason to think that it extended a helping hand to the needy outside the number of its initiates and thus outshone other pagan cults in relieving the distress that was so common on every side. How far below the Christian standard they all stood is revealed in the open letter (18) of St. Ambrose to the Emperor Valentinian in reply to the petition of Symmachus to have the statue of victory restored in the senate. "Why," writes the bishop, "did they not practise what we did if they allege our example? . . . The possessions of the Church are the maintenance of the poor. Let them count up how many

⁶ The Mithraic temples of Grosskrotzenburg and of Saalburg had adjoining graveyards. Cf. Wolff, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

captives the temples have ransomed, what food they have contributed to the poor, to what exiles they have supplied the means of loving." ⁷ Mithraism at this very time had distinguished representatives in Rome, among others, the illustrious friend of Symmachus, Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, who was not only a Mithraic high-priest, *pater patrum*, but also priest of Vesta, priest of the sun, augur, a curial of Hercules, consecrated to Liber and initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries, neocorus and hierophant, and a recipient of the taurobolium.⁸ Here, surely, was a man qualified to speak in behalf of Mithraism as well as of other forms of paganism. But there is no record that either he or any one else attempted to answer the challenge of St. Ambrose.

The resemblances between Mithraism and Christianity may be quickly summed up,—belief in the immortality of the soul, a future resurrection, judgment, heaven, and probably hell; a communion rite consisting in Mithraism of bread and water, to which Cumont would add wine; a purificatory rite of ablution in water, a feature common to practically all religions, having an outward resemblance to baptism. Other parallelisms are either too remote or too much exaggerated to deserve more than a passing notice. Such is the ceremony of branding the forehead of the Soldier initiate, so like the ceremony exacted of recruits in the Roman army before taking the *sacramentum*, or military oath, offering on the other hand but a remote resemblance to the Christian rite of confirmation, of which Tertullian thought it was a diabolic simulation.⁹ Again, from Cumont's designation of the seven grades of the initiation as the seven sacraments,¹⁰ the casual reader might be led to think that the seven sacraments of the Christian Church had their counterparts in Mithraism. It needs but a moment's reflection to recognize the vast difference between these initiation rites of

⁷ *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1896, x, p. 419.

⁸ Cf. *Textes et Mon.*, II, p. 95.

⁹ *On the Crown*, ch. 15.

¹⁰ *Myst. of Mithra*, p. 157.

Mithraism and the sacramental rites of Christianity.¹¹ Another instance of remote resemblance is the alleged office of mediator attaching to Mithra as compared with the mediatorship of Christ. Mithra is not an incarnate deity atoning for the sins of the world. Nor does Mithra as a doleful god offer ground for comparison with the "Man of sorrows." Cumont thinks that the sculptured features of Mithra express, as a rule, pain and sorrow, in some instances approaching the type of the classic head known as the Dying Alexander, now in the Uffizi gallery, Florence. But on this point not a few observers would be prepared to disagree with him.¹²

To account for these resemblances between Mithraism and Christianity, the hypothesis of Mithraic influence is entirely superfluous and untenable. The more authoritative scholars of Mithraism are not disposed to adopt it.¹³ It is only by ignoring the undeniable facts of history that a Mithraic origin could be ascribed to the Christian rites of baptism, Holy Eucharist, and confirmation, or to the Christian doctrines of the soul, resurrection, the future life, and the office of mediator assumed by Christ. Baptisms were used in the ancient religion of the Jews as well as in other religions of the Orient and of the Roman empire. It is an historical fact that Our Lord took this Jewish rite already existing and elevated it to the dignity of a sacrament. In like manner, bread and wine formed part

¹¹ If the Mithraists spoke of their seven grades as *sacraments*, a thing of which we have no proof, they used the word, not in the meaning of sacrament but, as Cumont has pointed out, in that of oath. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 156. It seems to be in this latter sense, too, that Tertullian uses the word *sacramentum* when he speaks of the Mithraic Soldier being put to the test of fidelity. Cf. *On the Crown*, ch. 15.

¹² It is to be regretted that on page 192 of the *Mysteries of Mithra*, where the cut of the so-called Dying Alexander is given, the translator has labeled it, "The Passion of the God," as if it were a representation of Mithra. Were it a figure of the light-god, the Phrygian cap would not be lacking.

¹³ Cf. Cumont, *Myst. of Mithra*, pp. 194, 195; Gasquet, *op. cit.*, p. 122. Reinach, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, II, p. 227, thinks that if elements of Mithraic belief and practise had made their way into Christianity, Julian the Apostate would not have failed to point them out and thus make an argument against the religion he so cordially hated.

of the paschal sacrificial meal celebrated by the Jews from the time of their exodus from Egypt. These were the elements which Christ chose at the Last Supper to constitute the Eucharistic Sacrament of his Real Presence. This fact of history cannot be obscured. Nor can it be denied that the Christian teaching of the mediatorial and messianic office of Christ is an original feature, in harmony with prophetic utterances of the Old Testament. The doctrines of the immortality of the soul, of judgment, the resurrection, heaven and hell, of Satan and evil spirits, are but the Christianizing of beliefs traditional in the Jewish nation at the time of Christ. What Christianity drew from a Jewish origin, Mithraism derived in more or less distorted form from ancient Mazdaism. Whether there was any interchange of ideas between the ancient religions of the Jews and Persians is another question which cannot be entered into here. Suffice it to say that there is solid ground for denying an infiltration of Mazdean beliefs into ancient Judaism, to become later on elements of Christian faith.

But even if we had not an accurate and certain knowledge of the independent origin of the Christian sacraments and of Christian beliefs, there would be no warrant for deriving them from Mithraism. For the countries in which the Christian religion first took form and flourished,—Palestine, Greece and the coast regions of Asia Minor—are the very ones in which the cult of Mithra never took root. In Rome, as we have seen, Mithraism did not begin to attract attention till towards the close of the first century, and did not assume importance till the middle of the second. Hence it could not have come in contact with Christianity early enough to have exercised any marked influence on its chief rites or doctrines. Again one has never explained how the Christian religion could have borrowed from a cult like Mithraism, whose rites and teachings were guarded from public knowledge by a veil of secrecy as strict as that which hides the inner ceremonies of a lodge of free-masons. Only a few of the early apologists and Church fathers show any acquaintance with Mithraism, and such knowledge as they had, being based on hearsay, was quite superficial.

It would, of course, be going too far to assert that the development of the Church's liturgy in its minor details was wholly uninfluenced by the pagan religions of Rome. From the end of the first century, Greek and Roman gentiles formed the preponderating factor in the Church. Being converts and children of converts, they were familiar with the symbolism and ritual of the popular forms of pagan worship. In these religions were features that commended themselves as dignified and appropriate expressions of religious feeling. It was but natural that some of these worthy features should be adopted into the Christian ritual. Again, religious customs of a superstitious character that were too deeply rooted in the life of the people to be abolished, were wisely given a new turn and a new meaning so as to conform to Christian faith. Such, for example, was the substitution of the feast of Christmas for the popular festival of the birth of the Invincible Sun, *dies natalis solis invicti*, on the 25th of December, the time of the winter solstice, according to the Roman calendar. This pagan feast was associated with the cult of the sun, established by the emperor Aurelian in 273, a cult not to be confounded with that of Mithra. Though not a few authors speak of it as a Mithraic feast, it was not Mithraic at least in origin, for the great feast of the birth of the Sun Mithra fell on the 16th of the month Mihr, corresponding to the first day of October. Pope Liberius seems to have fixed the date of Christmas for the 25th of December. It gradually spread to the Orient.

Dill¹⁴ and a few other writers have expressed the opinion that the early Church fathers saw in Mithraism a serious menace to the Christian faith. Toutain,¹⁵ Harnack,¹⁶ and others think otherwise, and this view seems to come nearer the truth. Mithraism was closed to the Greek world, and in the West, as Toutain has convincingly shown, it was never popular in the sense that it was adopted by the great middle class

¹⁴ *Rom. Society from Nero to M. Aurelius*, p. 622. So Réville, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 177.

¹⁶ *Expansion of Christianity*, II, p. 450.

of citizens. Outside of Rome and the surrounding towns, where it obtained a fairly strong foothold, and of the Rhone valley, which was thickly settled with incomers from the Orient, it was not conspicuous except along the great northern frontier, where the military forts abounded. More than three fourths of the Mithraic inscriptions and monuments extant have come from these regions, regions where the towns were insignificant and where the Roman citizens were few in number. In the island of Britain, the only Mithraic inscriptions are those of soldiers. In the thickly populated countries of Spain, Africa, and of Gaul west of the Rhone valley, there are but a handful of scattered monuments of Mithraism, and even these owe their existence in most instances to the piety of military worshippers. The great middle class of townspeople in the provinces did not leave any records of devotion to Mithra. If from the names preserved in the Mithraic inscriptions we set aside those of the soldiers, slaves and freedmen,—men in large measure of foreign birth,—we find left but a very small number, and these are chiefly names of high born and wealthy citizens. In view of this Toutain says:—"The religion of Mithra was not popular in the towns nor in the country districts. In all the Latin provinces it kept its character of a foreign cult imported by soldiers, officials, slaves, and colonists, all of oriental origin. It did not strike deep root in the soil in which it had been transplanted."¹⁷

"Mithraism," says Harnack, "seldom managed to rise even in the West (so far as I know) to the higher levels of intellectual culture. The emperor and the army supported it, and thereby it acquired an importance for wider circles in the empire. But a religion whose influence, properly speaking, was confined to the capital and to the outer circumference of the empire—a circumference of which large sections soon lapsed definitely into barbarian hands—such a religion could not possibly win a decisive triumph over the world."¹⁸

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 168.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 450. In view of this restricted influence of Mithraism, as well as of its readiness to ally itself with other forms of pagan worship,

In respect to wideness of diffusion, Christianity had a great advantage over Mithraism. In the Greek-speaking world, which was closed to the cult of Mithra, the Christian religion made rapid progress. By the latter half of the third century, it had won many adherents from all classes of society in both East and West. To quote Harnack:—"Christianity was a religion of towns and cities; the larger the town or city, the larger (even relatively, it is probable) was the number of Christians. This lent it an extraordinary advantage. But alongside of this, Christianity had already penetrated deep into the country districts, throughout a large number of the provinces, as we know definitely with regard to the majority of the provinces in Asia Minor, no less than as regards Armenia, Syria, Egypt, Palestine, and Northern Africa (with its country towns).¹⁹

There is good reason to think that in Italy, in the latter half of the third century, the Christians far outnumbered the worshippers of Mithra. Harnack estimates the number of Christians in Rome in 250 A. D. to have been not less than 30,000, and thinks that in the next fifty years the number increased at least twofold and possibly fourfold. He finds it significant that as early as 251 A. D., as many as sixty bishops could be gathered together in synod from out of the way places in Italy. So strong was Christianity at this time that the emperor Decius (249-251 A. D.) declared he would sooner have a rival emperor in Rome than a Christian bishop.²⁰

Now the known number of Mithraic temples in Italy does not warrant the view that Mithra-worshippers were by any means so numerous. It would be a liberal estimate to allow

there is little truth in Renan's oft-quoted statement that "if Christianity had been checked in its growth by some deadly disease, the world would have become Mithraic." *Marc-Aurèle*, p. 579. In his recent work, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, p. 142, Cumont has a sentence somewhat of the same import. He says: "Never, not even during the Mohammedan invasions, had Europe a narrower escape from becoming Asiatic than when Diocletian officially recognized Mithra as the protector of the reconstructed empire." There is good reason to think that this danger has been exaggerated.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 456.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 467.

that there were as many as three hundred Mithraic temples in Italy at this period. Perhaps two hundred would be nearer the mark. Considering the small size of these temples, which would hold on an average not more than one hundred worshippers, the whole number of Mithraists need not have exceeded thirty thousand.²¹

In no city did Mithraism have so many temples as in Rome. Cumont enumerates the remains of thirty, eighteen of which were private chapels of diminutive size. But an incident related by St. Jerome seems to indicate that in his time the number of Mithra-worshippers in Rome was relatively insignificant. In his letter to Laeta (107), he calls to mind the zeal of her noble kinsman Gracchus, who while prefect of the city (378 A. D.), destroyed on the eve of his baptism a temple of Mithra together with the hideous images it contained. That this act of intemperate zeal did not cause a violent commotion, such as happened in Alexandria on a similar occasion, can hardly be explained except on the hypothesis that in Rome the worship of Mithra did not concern more than a very small number of citizens.

Mithraism was not, and could not be, a serious rival of the Christian religion. The map of diffusion of Mithraism, says Harnack, "points to the real reason why the cult of Mithra could not gain the day, and why its religion had to continue weak, despite the wide extension of its diffusion. For *the entire domain of Hellenism was closed to it*, and consequently Hellenism itself. Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, Bithynia, Asia, the central provinces of Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and Egypt—none of these had any craving for the cult of Mithra. And these were the civilized countries *par excellence*. They were closed to Mithra and as he thus failed to get into touch at all

²¹ Cumont, *Myst. of Mithra*, p. 170, says: "The size of the temples in which they worshipped is proof that the number of members was always very limited. Even supposing that Participants only were allowed to enter the subterranean crypt and that the initiates of inferior grade were admitted only to the vestibule, it is impossible that these societies should have counted more than one hundred members."

with Hellenism, his cult was condemned to the position of a barbarous sect."²²

Mithraism was destined by its very nature to be, not a world-religion like Christianity, but the exclusive cult of a restricted number of worshippers. A religion that rigidly excluded all women from participation in its worship, that restricted the initiates to such men alone as had the courage and the power of physical endurance to undergo its severe tests, that celebrated its ritual in underground temples absolutely hidden from public gaze, such a religion was never meant, and was never fit, to become the religion of a nation.

The early apologists, when they spoke of Mithraism, treated it with the same bitterness and contempt that they showed towards other pagan religions. They declared that such of its rites as resembled those of Christianity were imitations suggested by the devil so as to ensnare and fetter souls. We can condone this harsh estimate of paganism in general and of Mithraism in particular, when we bear in mind the tremendous obstacles that paganism put in the way of Christian progress, especially the extreme cruelties and revolting outrages employed against Christians by their pagan persecutors. At the present day, a calmer judgment is possible. One may recognize that cults like that of Mithra, like those of Isis and of Cybele, despite their defects, were not inventions of the devil, but the earnest, though imperfect efforts of man to bring himself into communion with the divine. In those mysteries, notwithstanding their strong hostility to the Gospel of Christ, there were influences that worked indirectly for the good of Christianity, and helped in some measure to smooth the way to faith in Christ. These oriental cults thrived for a time in the West because they satisfied somewhat a deeply felt want. Roman worship was cold, stiff, formal, more like rendering a debt of justice to the gods. It laid chief stress on the securing of welfare on earth, though future peace of soul was not altogether neglected. On the other hand, the oriental cults gave a warmth and feeling to religious worship. In their chants, their processions, their rich and

²² *Op. cit.*, II, p. 447-448.

imposing ceremonial, their very orgies, they aroused and gave expression to the religious emotions, often, it is true, to an extravagant degree. Their deities, especially Mithra and Isis, were brought near to the worshipper by ties of filial confidence and gratitude. Mithra was the benevolent protector, Isis the tender mother. Both these cults laid great stress on the future life, and held out the hope of a bodily resurrection and of eternal bliss in heaven. To this end a certain amount of abstinence and asceticism was inculcated, and the use of quasi-sacramental rites. Thus at a time when the Church scarcely dared to raise her head, the Roman world, through these oriental cults, was being made familiar with rites and doctrines that in their purity and integrity were in the possession of the Church of Christ. The way was thus prepared in some measure for conversion to Christianity, and when Constantine and his successors gave the Church the freedom to expand, it drew to its fold innumerable throngs of converts. It triumphed over the pagan cults because it satisfied better than they the religious cravings of the soul, because it held out a higher moral ideal, because it won the approval of reason by its unique monotheism, its wonderful practise of charity, and its freedom from debasing superstitions. In vain did Julian, during his short reign, try to infuse new life in dying paganism by encouraging religious devotion to the Invincible Sun. The very countries where the mysteries of Mithra, of Isis, and of Cybele first rose and flourished,—Armenia, Pontus, Phrygia, Egypt,—soon became overwhelmingly Christian. As the Church of Christ increased at leaps and bounds, these oriental cults diminished. After the fifth century, Mithra and Isis and Cybele were but empty shadows of once mighty names.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

THE INFLUENCE OF SPAIN ON ENGLISH LITERATURE.¹

Before an audience of Spanish Americans, and on St. Patrick's Day, it will perhaps be pardonable if I, an Irishman, begin this discourse by quoting the following lines:—

They came from a land beyond the sea,
And now o'er the western main
Set sail, in their good ships, gallantly,
From the sunny land of Spain.
“Oh, where's the Isle we've seen in dreams,
Our destin'd home or grave?”
Thus sang they as, by the morning's beams,
They swept the Atlantic wave.

And, lo where afar o'er ocean shines
A sparkle of radiant green,
As though in that deep lay emerald mines,
Whose light through the wave was seen.
“'Tis Innisfail—'tis Innisfail!”
Rings o'er the echoing sea;
While, bending to heav'n, the warriors hail
That home of the brave and free.

Then turn'd they unto the Eastern wave,
Where now their Day-God's eye
A look of such sunny omen gave
As lighted up sea and sky.
Nor frown was seen through sky or sea,
Nor tear o'er leaf or sod,
When first on their Isle of Destiny
Our great forefathers trod.

With the event thus commemorated by Thomas Moore, I

¹This article is, in substance, a lecture delivered to The Spanish American Atheneum in the Auditorium of the National Museum, Washington, D. C., on March 17, 1913.

begin the story of the influence of Spain on English literature. This coming of the Milesians to Ireland from Spain, where they had been long settled, was, when viewed in the light of its after results, one of the most important historical happenings on record. It occurred 1300 years before the birth of Christ, and the kingly race that then conquered Ireland held sway there for over 2,400 years, until the Norman invader usurped their authority in 1169 A. D. Their descendants are not only numerous in Ireland to-day, but also, with the tide of Irish emigration, they are scattered in many lands. They went to Russia, to Austria, to France, to Australia, to Latin-America; some found their way back to Spain and reached high honours there; and in no country of the world are they more numerous than in these United States.

The Milesians were an intelligent and a warlike race, and they had the faculty of increasing and multiplying. In pagan times they sallied forth from their island home, and, carrying conquest everywhere, they carved out with their good swords kingdoms for themselves in Scotland, and made incursions into England and Gaul and Switzerland and right up to the confines of Italy. Soon after Christianity came to them with St. Patrick in 432 A. D., Ireland became the centre of civilisation and education for Europe. From all lands eager students flocked to her shores to drink of the fountains of knowledge, which for centuries flowed there in a lavish stream. But while the foreigner was coming to Ireland during this her golden age in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, she was herself busy in sending out fervent missionaries and educators, anxious to spread the gospel truth in pagan lands. To the Frank and the Burgundian, to the dwellers along the Rhine and the Danube, to Switzerland, to Italy, to Norway, to Iceland, she sent her bearers of the good tidings; and she sent them also nearer home, to her own kinsmen in Scotland, and to northern England. An Irish prince, St. Columbkille, evangelised Scotland from the little island of Iona, and St. Aidan and others of Columbkille's successors extended their ministrations to the northern kingdoms of the so-called Saxon Heptarchy in England.

Now, the first English poet whose name we know was Caed-

mon. He flourished about the year 670. Every one is familiar with his history, as told by the Venerable Bede. Caedmon was attached to the monastery which King Oswy of Northumbria had established in 658 on the wind-swept promontory of Whitby. Caedmon's very name seems to imply that he was of Celtic descent; some scholars even think that he was of the Milesian stock. At all events, the section of country where he dwelt and the monastery to which he belonged owed their Christianity to Irish monks; and it was Irish or Irish-trained clerics who read to him those portions of the Bible which he versified. Here surely we have a connection—remote, I admit, but still a connection—between the Milesians who came from Spain and the very beginnings of native English literature.

Again, after the Bible, no single book has contributed so much material to English poetry and romance as Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*. Geoffrey was a Welshman and therefore a Celt, and he had all the imagination for which the Celtic race is noted. His romantic history contained for the first time the nucleus and many of the details of the Arthurian legends, which have formed the blood and bone and sinew of so much English literature, from Layamon's *Brut* in the thirteenth century down to Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* in the nineteenth. In course of time there were grafted on to the strictly Arthurian legends others which came from different countries. The most famous perhaps of all these is the story of Tristram and Iseult, which is among the oldest, as it is one of the most poetical, of the tales thus introduced. It is difficult to say to what country it originally belonged: it has been assigned to Cornwall, Wales, Brittany, and Ireland. Irish writers have always claimed it as their own, and the original Iseult, the heroine of the story, was undoubtedly a daughter of Ireland. Chapelizod, one of the most ancient suburbs of Dublin, is called after her to this day. *Tristram and Iseult* is one of the great love-tales of the world. When we remember such works as Malory's *Morte D'Arthur* or Swinburne's *Tristram of Lyonesse*—to name no others—we see what a source of inspiration it was to English writers.

Therefore, through Caedmon in the seventh century, and the

legends of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, I think that an influence of Spain on English literature, exercised indirectly through her bold Milesian invaders of Ireland, may fairly be claimed.

From the period we have now reached the points of contact both friendly and hostile between England and Spain, in the Old World and in the New, have been many and various. If we look to the highest places, we find that in the twelfth century Richard Coeur de Lion married at Cyprus on May 12, 1190, a Spanish princess in the person of Berengaria, daughter of Sancho, king of Navarre; and how much English literature is indebted to that alliance no one who has read Sir Walter Scott's novel of the third crusade, *The Talisman*, will need to be reminded.

In the thirteenth century Edward I., surnamed Longshanks, espoused in 1254, when he was in his sixteenth year, Eleanor, daughter of Ferdinand III., king of Castile. If tradition is to be believed, Eleanor covered herself with glory and earned immortality by sucking the poison from a wound in her husband's arm when he was set upon in Palestine, during the ninth and last crusade, by a would-be assassin, who used a poisoned weapon in his endeavour to dispatch the valorous young prince. Be that as it may, it is on all hands agreed that she was one of the best, most charitable, and most estimable women that ever occupied the English throne; but that did not save her in a later age from baseless slanders and from having her character outrageously and cruelly distorted by George Peele in his play of *Edward I.*, written at a time (1593) when everyone and everything Spanish was loathed, hated, and feared in England.

One result of the armed intervention in 1367 of the Black Prince, son of Edward III., on behalf of that Pedro, king of Castile, who is known in Spanish history by the contradictory titles of "Il Cruel" and "Il Justiciero," was that his brother, John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, married (1370) as his second wife Constance, the elder of the two daughters and heiresses of Pedro. In right of her John of Gaunt took the

title of King of Castile, and in 1386-1388 was actually absent from England for three years in an attempt to make good his claim. In this he failed, for John I., son of Henry of Trastámara, was too securely seated on the throne to be dislodged; but the English prince made a treaty with John, by virtue of which his daughter, Catherine, became queen of Castile some years later. This Catherine married Prince Henry, afterwards Henry III. of Castile, and by him became the mother of John II. of Castile, who was the father of Isabella the Catholic, queen of Castile. Isabella married Ferdinand of Aragon, and their descendants were kings of Spain till the coming in of the Bourbon dynasty in 1700. Ferdinand and Isabella were the parents of Catherine of Aragon, wife, successively, of the two sons of Henry VII. of England, namely, Prince Arthur and King Henry VIII. For what a world of literature the train of events I have just sketched, and in particular that union of the Spanish princess with two English princes, and her divorce from the second, was directly and indirectly responsible, it would take volumes to recount. Suffice it here to say that, from Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, in 1590, to Shakespeare and Fletcher's *Henry VIII.*, in 1613, the crop of literature it produced was prodigious in quantity and sometimes excellent in quality. Nor was its force soon spent. Its echoes reverberate adown the ages. In the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries the marriage and divorce of Henry VIII. and Catherine of Aragon, and the consequences thereby entailed, were the direct and indirect cause of multitudinous English works both in verse and prose.

Nor must we forget, in our rapid review of historical happenings in high places in relation to English literature, that John of Gaunt's son, King Henry IV., married, as his second wife, Joan, daughter of a king of Navarre; that a king of Spain, Philip II., reigned in England as husband of an English queen (Mary, daughter of Catherine of Aragon) from July, 1554, to November 17, 1558, and on the death of Mary was a candidate for the hand of her successor and half-sister Elizabeth; that prince Charles, afterwards Charles I., was the suitor of an infanta of Spain; nor, finally, that an English

princess, Princess Ena of Battenberg, now occupies with her husband the throne of Spain as Queen Victoria.

If we turn from the contemplation of the affairs of dynasties to the contemplation of political events, what a number of connections between England and Spain meets our view! From the year 1349, in the reign of Edward III., down to comparatively modern times, we find a continued succession of wars, in which England and Spain were sometimes allies, fighting together against a common foe; but sometimes, and much more frequently, were themselves enemies, and were contending for supremacy and for the possession of territory in Europe and America and in western and southern seas.

It is not my province to go into the detailed history of those wars, battles, negotiations, and treaties. The principal events, such as the battle of St. Quentin in 1557, in which the Spaniards aided by the English defeated the French; the projected invasion of England by the Invincible Armada in 1588; the battle of the Dunes in 1658, in which the French and English defeated the Spaniards; the War of the Spanish Succession from 1702 to 1713; the capture of Porto Bello in the isthmus of Darien in 1739 by Admiral Vernon; the seizing of Havana and Manila in 1762 and their restoration to Spain by the Treaty of Paris in 1763; the battle of Trafalgar in 1805; and the Peninsular War from 1808 to 1814, are in any case too well known to need recapitulation. The point I wish to make is that the various political events and the relations between the English and Spanish courts had their effect on English literature and on English writers.

Thus, William Tyndale, the translator of the bible and author of various controversial pamphlets, had an end put to his literary productivity when he was carried beyond the walls of the free city of Antwerp to Vilvorde, where the emperor-king of Spain held sway, and was there strangled and burned as a heretic (1536).

Some fifty years later, Thomas Lodge joined in an expedition to the Canaries against the Spaniards in 1588, and on the way wrote his romance *Rosalynde: Euphues Golden Legacie*, which, important in itself, derives a greatly enhanced interest from the

fact that it supplied Shakespeare with the characters and incidents of *As You Like It*.

From the second expedition fitted out by Sir Walter Raleigh for North America under the command of his cousin, Sir Richard Grenville, there resulted, in 1591, Raleigh's celebrated pamphlet on the *Fight about the Isles of the Azores*, which in turn was the inspiration of Gervase Markham's poem (1595) in 174 eight-line stanzas on that subject, and of what is in some respects the greatest war lyric of modern times, namely, Tennyson's *The Revenge: A Ballad of the Fleet*. Again, Raleigh's own first voyage to Guiana in 1595—on which occasion he took formal possession of that country in the queen's name—was the occasion of the production in 1596 of his *Discovery of the Large, Rich, and Beautiful Empire of Guiana*. This was sneered at at the time of course, and later was held up to obloquy by the possessor of a great name as being "full of the grossest and most palpable lies that were ever attempted to be imposed on the credulity of mankind"; but subsequent explorers of Venezuela, part of Raleigh's "Guiana," have shown that in the main his statements were accurate. It was during his second expedition to Guiana, in 1617, that Raleigh gave such offence to the king of Spain that James I., who was at that time particularly anxious to stand well with the Spanish court, had him executed on October 29, 1618. He was thus prevented from completing his gigantic *History of the World*, on which he had been engaged during his twelve and a half years' imprisonment in the Tower of London from 1604 to 1616.

Another gifted English writer, who did great things, and, if he had lived longer, would have done greater, had his career cut short in its prime owing to a war between England and Spain. When Sir Philip Sidney fell at Zutphen in 1586, in his thirty-second year, there probably perished one of the greatest "inheritors of unfulfilled renown" that England or the world has ever seen.

The invasion of the Armada was fruitful in literature. I need do no more than mention Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1607), Alexander Hume's *The Triumph of the*

Lord, Kingsley's *Westward Ho!*, or Macaulay's spirited but unfinished ballad of *The Armada*, with its stately beginning:

Attend, all ye who list to hear our noble England's praise,
I tell of the thrice famous deeds she wrought in ancient days,
When that great fleet invincible against her bore in vain
The richest spoils of Mexico, the stoutest hearts of Spain.

Raleigh paid the penalty of his life for undue interference with the property of Spaniards in Guiana. That, however, did not prevent anti-Spanish feeling from making itself manifest a few years later towards the close of the reign of James the First. It took a very concrete form in Thomas Middleton's play, *The Game at Chess* (1624). This play set all London agog, but gave great offence at court. It brought on the stage the king of Spain and his ambassador, Gondomar, as well as King James I. himself and sundry English politicians. It certainly pushed daring to the limit. The Induction was delivered by Loyola and his close friend Error. James was the White King, Philip IV. the Black King, Gondomar the Black Knight, and the Church of England was the White Queen's Pawn. The Black Knight is free in his speech, and pretty plainly indicates that to compass his own ends he has cajoled, deceived, and duped the White King. All this was so outrageously opposed to the requirements of diplomacy that Gondomar's successor made a strong complaint to the British sovereign. Middleton at first made himself scarce, but ultimately he and the players were taken before the Privy Council, and severely reprimanded for their audacity in "bringing modern Christian kings upon the stage." This inhibition against showing living or recently deceased potentates in an acted play has remained an unwritten law of the English dramatic censor ever since. We had a startling reminder of it only a few years ago in the outcry against Hall Caine's *Eternal City*, in which a Pope figures, and still more recently in the withdrawal of Gilbert and Sullivan's comic opera, *The Mikado*, from representation, in response to a "request" from the highest quarter.

The War of the Spanish Succession was specially fertile

in the production of English literature. It gave us *The Campaign* (1704), that poem made to order which was the first stepping stone to Addison's political greatness; it gave us numerous other pieces about Marlborough's exploits; it gave us the masterly journalism of *The Examiner* and *The Old Whig*; it was the immediate cause of Swift's great pamphlets on *The Conduct of the Allies*, *The Barrier Treaty*, and *The Public Spirit of the Whigs*; and it inspired Arbuthnot's delightful travesty, *The History of John Bull*. Above all, we must remember that it was this war that produced Addison's first contribution to the *Tatler*, and thereby paved the way for those delightful essays in the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, the *Guardian*, and the *Freeholder*, which are among the great ornaments of English literature, and on account of which the fame of Addison can never die.

But for the Peninsular War we should not have had some of Wordsworth's fine sonnets in his "Independence and Liberty" series, nor his flaming pamphlet on *The Convention of Cintra*; nor yet some of the descriptive and reflective stanzas in the first canto of Byron's *Childe Harold*.

Nor is the tale yet all told. Shelley's magnificent *Ode to Liberty* (1820) was occasioned by the successful rising of the Spanish nation against its king. Tennyson as a young man went to Spain with his friend Hallam, apparently with warlike intentions; but while nothing of a military nature came of the expedition, from a literary point of view the experience was valuable, for the abiding impression left by the wild scenery of the Pyrenees is shown clearly in *Oenone*. George Eliot's *Spanish Gypsy* (1868) was the result of the author's desire to write a dramatic poem to enforce the lesson of her historic novel *Romola*; and, as she intended to place the action in Spain, she made a stay of some duration in that country in order to get the necessary "local colour." To Borrow's residence in Spain as a colporteur for the British and Foreign Bible Society we owe not only his *Zincali, or Gypsies of Spain* (1841), but also the work which first made him famous, namely, *The Bible in Spain* (1843), as well as *Lavengro* (1851) and *The Romany Rye* (1857).

Finally, to conclude this line of thought, we must take into account the magnificent historical literature in the English language of which Spain and its dependencies have been the immediate cause. If, in this connection, I suggest the great names of Robertson, Washington Irving, Prescott, and Napier, it will be enough to indicate my meaning.

Leaving the historical and geographical or, as I may term it, the external influence—which I have touched only in barest outline—I turn now to the internal or literary influence proper.

Let me first direct attention to Guevara. Antonio de Guevara, a Franciscan monk who became Bishop of Mondoñedo (d. 1545), was the official chronicler of Charles V. For the emperor's edification Guevara composed *El Reloj de Principes*, or "Dial of Princes," which was turned into English by John Bouchier Lord Berners (1467-1533) from a French translation. This is the same Lord Berners who is so celebrated as the translator of the *Chronicles of Froissart*. His version of the Spanish work, which was finished only a week before his death, had the high-sounding title of *The Golden Book of Marcus Aurelius, Emperour and Eloquent Oratour*. It was first published in 1539, and between that date and 1586 went through at least seven editions. It was also translated into English by Sir Thomas North, under the title of *The Diall of Princes*, in 1568. The original Spanish work was written in a highly rhetorical style, and the vogue it obtained in England through its two translations is held to have fostered and developed the growth of that artificial style of writing known as Euphuism, from John Lyly's *Euphues* (1579-1580), the most celebrated book of that class. *Euphues* in turn influenced Greene, Lodge, Rich, and other Elizabethan writers. We also find its influence at a later period in what Johnson called the metaphysical school of poets. It naturally attracted the attention of Shakespeare, who caricatured the style in *Love's Labour's Lost*; but he is himself more affected by Euphuism than is generally known.

Early influences of Spanish literature upon English literature are to be found in the domain of the prose romance, of

the pastoral, and of the picaresque novel. Springing up originally in Portugal there grew into being through various accretions taken on from time to time the celebrated romance *Amadis de Gaula*, as we have it preserved in a Spanish prose work, which was put together by Ordoñez de Montalvo towards the end of the fifteenth century. This book, which is a compound of medievalism and comparative modernity, became the norm for the romances of chivalry. Its influence is easily perceptible, for example, in such a work as Barnabe Rich's *The Straunge and Wonderful Adventures of Don Simonides, a Gentilman Spaniard*, which has some claims to rank as the earliest of modern romances. *Amadis* was translated into English by Anthony Munday, whose version was published in complete form in 1620.

The reaction against romance first appears in the pastoral. Knights of impossible prowess and ladies of supereminent beauty and grace become shepherds and shepherdesses. For court and camp and tilting ground are substituted gently purling streams and umbrageous sycamores. *Amadis* no longer traverses Europe in search of adventure to let Oriana see his worth. Instead, he sits down and composes madrigals to voice his lament over unrequited love. With Jacopo Sannazaro, an Italian, this sort of composition may be said to have had its beginning in modern times. His *Arcadia* belongs to 1504. But the pastoral writer who most influenced England was the Portuguese Jorge de Montemayor (d. 1561), who became a Spaniard by adoption, and in good Castilian composed his *Diana* in 1558. Much more than Sannazaro, Montemayor was the inspirer of Sidney's *Arcadia* (written 1578-1580, first published 1590). We can find traces of the influence of this work of Sidney's in several of Shakespeare's plays as, for example, in *Love's Labour's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Tempest*, and *King Lear*. To Sidney's pastoral romance Spenser and Crowne were also somewhat indebted. Numerous plays had their origin in its episodes. Through Sidney, therefore, Montemayor exercised a far-reaching influence. Montemayor, as well as Lyly, can also be traced in Greene's *Menaphon*,

and several works of that school. The *Diana* was translated into English by Bartholomew Young in 1598, and in this form had a great vogue.

The prose picaresque novel, or rogue story, was started in Spain with *Lazarillo de Tormes* in 1554. This work was translated into English by David Rowland in 1576. It was imitated by Thomas Nash in *The Unfortunate Traveller, or the Life of Jack Wilton* (1594), which is by some regarded as having introduced the novel into England. It is at all events a striking departure in realistic fiction from the romances and pastorals previously in vogue. It was followed in the next year (1595) by Henry Chettle's picaresque novel, *Pierce Plainnes Seven Years Prentiship*; and the influence of *Lazarillo* is traceable through a number of imitations down to Defoe and beyond him to Fielding and Smollett.

Students of religious poetry, of mystical poetry and prose, and of devotional works in general cannot afford to leave out of account the impression made upon England, as well as upon the rest of Europe, by the writings of Saint Teresa (1515-1582), Luis Ponce de Leon (1527-1591), and San Juan de la Cruz (1542-1591). For example, it is of the first importance for any one who would properly appreciate Richard Crashaw, most mystical of English poets, to understand thoroughly his indebtedness to the ecstatic writings of Saint Teresa. Another chain of influence is established here, for we have it on Coleridge's own authority that Crashaw's hymns probably suggested the first thought of the whole poem of *Christabel*, and were certainly ever present to his mind while he was composing the second part; and there is no blinking the fact that Shelley, Francis Thompson, and many another nineteenth century English poet came under the fascination of Crashaw.

When we come to the stage, we find a great amount of Spanish influence. Some of the Elizabethan dramas, such as Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* (1592), George Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* (1594), and Robert Greene's *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*, have their scene laid in Spain, and profess to follow Spanish legend or history. *Calisto and Melebea*, an interlude

in rime royal, published by John Rastell about 1530, is thought to be the first English play that can be traced to a Spanish source. It is founded on the first four acts or parts of the dramatic novel *Celestina* (c. 1499), written principally, if not entirely, by Fernando de Rojas. Even Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* (1587) is partly founded on Pedro Mexia's *Silva de varia lección*, which was accessible in Italian, French, and English translations. Montemayor, whom we have already seen influencing Sidney, Greene, and others, had told in his *Diana* the story of Felix and Felisinena, which probably gave Shakespeare the idea for his Julia and Proteus in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

It is perhaps pushing slight correspondences too far to say that *Twelfth Night* is indebted to Lope de Rueda's *Comedia de los Engaños*; *The Taming of the Shrew* to *Conde Lucanor*; or *The Tempest* to Antonio de Esclava's *Noches de Invierno*. But of the fifty-two plays attributed to Beaumont and Fletcher, seventeen have been traced in greater or less degree to Spanish sources. It can scarcely be doubted that Fletcher derived the plots for *The Chances*, *The Queene of Corinth*, *The Faire Maide of the Inne*, and *Love's Pilgrimage*, and the under-plot of *Rule a Wife and have a Wife*, from a translation of Cervantes' *Novelas Exemplares*, or his *Custome of the Country* from a translation of the *Persiles y Sigismunda* of the same author. Other Spanish writers whom Fletcher utilised, probably in French or English translations, were Lope de Vega for *The Pilgrim*, Juan de Flores for *Woman pleas'd*, and Gonzalo de Cespedes for the *Spanish Curate* and for the comedy which he wrote in collaboration with Rowley, known as *The Maid in the Mill*. Middleton and Rowley combined two stories of Cervantes, *Le Fuerza de la Sangre* and *La Gitanilla*, in the tragic-comedy of *The Spanish Gipsie*. Massinger's *A Very Woman* is also based on Cervantes' *Novelas Exemplares*. Shirley is supposed to have borrowed from Spanish plays—from Tirso de Molina's *El Castigo del Penséque* for *The Opportunitie*, and from Lope de Vega's *Don Lope de Cadona* for *The Young Admirall*. Killigrew took *The Parson's Wedding* from Calde-

ron's *Dama Duende*, but did not find its almost unparalleled coarseness in the original. Sir Richard Fanshawe (1608-1666), who was ambassador to the courts of Portugal and Spain and died suddenly at Madrid in 1666, translated Hurtado de Mendoza's *Fiestas de Aranjuez* and *Querer por solo querer* ("To Love for Love's Sake"). Sir Samuel Tuke's *Adventures of Five Hours* (1662) is taken from *Los Empeños de Seis Horas* by Antonio Coello, and George Digby, Earl of Bristol's *Elvira, or the Worst not always True* (1667) is a free translation of Calderon's *No Siempre lo Peor es Cierto*. Finally, Dryden shows in some of his plays fairly distinct symptoms of Spanish influence.

In Samuel Butler's great satirical burlesque *Hudibras*, published in three parts in 1663, 1664, and 1678, respectively, we find plain traces of Cervantes. The setting of the poem and its leading idea of Sir Hudibras going out "a-colonelling" with his squire Ralph, as well as many of the incidents, are obviously based on *Don Quixote*; but the imitation is a reversal of the original. In *Don Quixote* our sympathy is always with the chivalric madman, whereas Butler's intention is to show everything connected with his hero in the vilest aspect. *Hudibras* is not entirely indebted to Cervantes: the influence of the Frenchmen, Rabelais and Scarron, and of the Englishman, Skelton, is also felt. While due allowance is made for all the borrowing, Butler remains unsurpassably original. Yet, had there been no *Don Quixote*, there would have been no *Hudibras*, at least in the form in which we now have it.

When Pope and Arbuthnot composed the satirical *Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works, and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus* (published in Pope's works, 1741), they adopted Cervantes as their model, and successfully copied at least his grave irony. Their Cornelius Scriblerus probably suggested to Sterne the idea of his Walter Shandy. Apart from this, the influence of the humour of Cervantes on some of the great eighteenth century and nineteenth century English novelists was marked. We can easily find it, not only in Sterne, but also in Fielding, Goldsmith, and Thackeray, and, less perceptibly

perhaps but still surely, in Smollett, Scott, Dickens, and Bulwer. In fact, the original title of Fielding's first novel—by which he introduced into England the comic Epic-Poem in Prose—was *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and his Friend Mr. Abraham Adams: written in Imitation of the Manner of Cervantes*. Even as a student at Leyden, Fielding had sketched a play called *Don Quixote in England*, and a bias towards Cervantes was his life-long characteristic.

Enough has been said to prove the influence of Spain on English literature. The way of the student of that literature is sometimes hard, but it is much more commonly extremely pleasant. Not the least delightful of the byways in which he will have occasionally to wander are those paths which lead him, in a straight line or by tortuous windings, to the sunny land of Spain. And if, in opposition to all the modern rules, I point the moral of this discourse, I think it plainly is that he who would thoroughly master English literature must add to his studies of other lands a loving study of the history, the language, and the literature of Spain.

P. J. LENNOX.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

GEORGE GISSING: A GRUB-STREET ARTIST.

Among the season's novels "The Private Life of Henry Maitland" has had a *succès de scandale*. It is a sordid revelation of the career of a noted man of letters, whom certain moral and social offences placed during his life outside the pale of society. These lose nothing of their crudity when presented under the guise of fiction which seeks dramatic relief by darkening the moral perversity on the shining background of the man's genius. Such a method permits of no mitigation, no reserve which would defeat the end of melodrama.

The title of the novel is evidently intended to suggest "The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft," a veiled autobiography, one of the last books of the late George Gissing. Gissing was known to the public as a man who, after a liberal education in the Classics, for which he had a special genius, drifted through misadventure into journalism and novel-writing, by which he tried to eke out an existence. He wrote many novels of the drab-colored life and shabby-genteel existence of the lower-middle classes in the tenements or suburban life of London. They are sombre studies in the manner of Dickens, characterized by the ineffectual pathos and meager compensations of existence under such conditions. All of them ring the changes on the common theme of the crime of poverty and the beauty of culture, which was the gospel of the author. He was not a success in this craft of fiction, which did not make a popular appeal because of its hopeless realism, and his novels hardly supported him. In the intervals of respite afforded by the returns of these pot-boilers, Gissing devoted himself to his real interests, and was wont to satisfy his scholar's hunger by sundry readings of Apuleius and Lucian, Diogenes Laertius, Petronius and the Greek Anthology in the British Museum Library. In later life came a chance bequest from some friend, permitting him to pursue his tastes unreservedly. Besides his novels he wrote three books which are a truer expression of himself and

a solace to lovers of literature—a study of Charles Dickens which ranks only with Chesterton's; a book of travel, "By the Ionian Sea"; and a *journal intime*, "The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft."

The last is a book of self-portraiture after the manner of Alexander Smith's "Dreamthorp." It purports to be a journal kept in later years of ease and affluence by Henry Ryecroft, a man of letters, who had unexpectedly inherited a competence after a lifelong struggle in Grub Street. There is, however, no hint of the disclosures made in the sensational novel referred to above. The quiet distinction of the writing, a style faultless in phrase and cadence, an elevation of thought, a sensitive feeling for Nature, and a pervading mood of mellow retrospect reflect the personality of a writer keenly sensible of the beautiful in art and letters. However fouled and grimed such a life might have become, the mind which penned this record seems to have remained singularly unsmirched to the end. At the time of writing, Gissing was living retired in a home he had purchased in Devon. There the book was written in the quiet of the study which is made familiar to us by many a reference to its cozy domesticity—its windows opening on a pleasant prospect of the valley of the Exe, the writing-table, shaded lamp, cases of books with gilt-titles gleaming at moments in the fire-light, and studies cheered by the "bland inspiration" of tea and tobacco. Thus he pictures for us the utter restfulness of his retirement after his grim struggle in London, and savours all the comforts of the home and leisure so long denied him. Here, freed from the grind of task-work, he could quietly mature his views on life and letters. He has no philosophy of life to offer, however, and we look in vain for that ripe wisdom garnered from experience, for Gissing was always inept and impractical, and on the side of religion, if we except a vague *pietas*, he was singularly insensible. His book is interesting only from the point of view of art, as an expression of life viewed through a temperament.

His temperament is Saxon in its demesticity—its pleasure in home-life and in the creature comforts of home, as well as in its self-sufficiency and superior scorning of the herd. English,

too, is that sense of intimacy in his relations with Nature, the special feeling of her consonance with his moods. His diary is divided according to the Seasons, and he muses lovingly on them as they circle through the year. He is quick to note the signs which mark their passing changes—when on the borders of winter “Spring’s foot half-falters” and he greets the firstcelandine, or when the awakening primrose or violet in the brakes gives promise of coming summer, or the last tintings of autumn glory fade in elm or beech or horse-chestnut:

“I recall my moments of delight, the recognition of each flower then unfolded, the surprise of budding branches clothed in a night with green. The first snowy gleam upon the black-thorn did not escape me. By its familiar bank, I watched for the earliest primrose, and in its copse I found the anemone. Meadows shining with buttercups, hollows sunned with the marsh marigold, held me long at gaze. These common things touch me with more of admiration and of wonder each time I behold them.”

To him, so long pent in a great city, their return was a miracle ever-renewed. Many word-pictures of wold and downs, lake and mountain, land- and sea- scape strew the pages. Sometimes an impressionistic effect of Nature is vividly rendered; for instance, the weirdness of winter landscape: “Snow is still falling. I see its ghostly glimmer against the vanishing sky.”

His life in his Devon retreat is utterly uneventful, given to golden hours of reverie and idleness, during which he can take deep breaths of the quiet and the silence, and enjoy to the full the amenities of his solitude: “the far, soft murmur of a train from the other side of Exe . . . the rustle of branches in the morning breeze, the music of a sunny shower against the window, the matin of birds.” The only event to break the routine is the arrival at intervals of a parcel of books over which he lingers with delight. The fervor of a book-lover breathes in his reference to them, and the names of his favourites, Homer and Shakespeare, Gibbon and Sam Johnson, Cicero, Virgil and Tibullus recur constantly. He has the joy of Charles Lamb in the old authors whom he prizes with the appreciation of a scholar; for promiscuous buyers “the glib many, the perky mis-

pronouncers of titles and of authors' names" he has nothing but impatience. And rarely is a volume noticed but receives illumination in the mention. With what subtle psychology of association, for instance, is the atmosphere of a book suggested in the following incident:

"Yesterday I was walking at dusk. I came to an old farmhouse; at the garden gate a vehicle stood waiting, and I saw it was our doctor's gig. Having passed I turned to look back. There was a faint afterglow in the sky beyond the chimneys; a light twinkled at one of the upper windows. I said to myself "Tristram Shandy," and hurried home to plunge into a book which I have not opened for I daresay twenty years."

The reading of his books at times stirs memories of the sacrifices by which some coveted volume was bought during his pinched life in London. There is a compelling pathos in the pitiful economies which made such purchases possible. Too often the hunger of the body was denied to satisfy that of the mind, and the coffee-house and tempting pastry-shop were resisted for the lure of some musty book-stall with its loved old quartos. And always London "multitudinous and lamp-lit" is the background of these reminiscences. The attic or garret in which his favorite books, Homer and Shakspeare, were read; the squalid boarding-houses of innumerable Mrs. Todgers; the inviting cook-shop windows with pies steaming, hot and savory, over a guttering gas-jet; the all-enveloping rain and fog and task-work pursued by lamp-light in the day-time—all these features of London familiar to the destitute literary hack are faithfully reproduced. These poignant experiences are recalled, with detachment, in a mood tempered by his present sense of material well-being. Moods of bitterness, indeed, still remain—moods of moroseness, self-absorption, dislike of society, a sense of the frustration of human life—to show how warped the man had become in the process. Not all his experiences are harrowing, however, and, at worst, were redeemed by physical health and the natural buoyancy of youth. Brighter memories, too, there are of his school-days, of occasional holidays when he followed the far-off call of sea waves, and, above all, of travel in the classic lands he loved so well and managed once to visit.

The latter remain with him an abiding delight, a gracious possession forever:

"I remember day-break on the Mediterranean; the shapes of islands growing in hue after hue of tenderest light, until they floated amid a sea of glory. And among the mountains—the crowning height, one moment a cold pallor, the next soft-glowing under the touch of the rosy-fingered goddess. These are the things I shall never see again; things indeed so perfect in memory that I should dread to blur them by a newer experience."

This is a classic vignette sketched with all the grace and restraint of classic art. Storied scenes revive and yield their proper atmosphere to his inspiration. Glamour is seldom absent from his pen when it touches the things of antiquity, or strays amid paths of old association. Here, for instance, is an evocation of the very spirit of Roman landscape:

"How many such moments come back to me as my thoughts wander. Dim little *trattorie* in city byways, inns smelling of the sun in forgotten valleys, on the mountain side, or by the tideless shore, where the grape has given me of its blood, and made life a rapture. No draught of wine amid the old tombs under the violet sky but made me for the time a better man, larger of brain, more courageous, more gentle. 'Twas a revelry whereon came no repentance. Could I live forever in thoughts and feelings such as those born to me in the shadows of the Italian vine.' There I listened to the sacred poets; there I walked amid the wise of old; there did the gods reveal to me the secret of their eternal calm. I hear the red rillet as it flows into the rustic glass; I see the purple light upon the hills. Fill to me again, thou of the Roman visage and all but Roman speech. Is not yonder the long gleaming of the Appian way? Chant in the old measure, the song imperishable

"dum Capitolium

Scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex"

aye, and for how many an age when Pontiff and vestal sleep in the eternal silence."

"By the Ionian Sea" is a wholly beautiful record of wanderings in Southern Italy and Sicily, in quest, no doubt, of materials for his historic novel "Veranilda." As in the perfection of such writing the casual incidents of the way are invested with historic interest, the chance happenings are made expressive of the genius of the people among whom he travelled, and old sites and scenes are charged with their wealth of association. He touches with charm the chequered fortunes of once famous *loci classici*, now pausing with an antiquarian's zeal to re-establish some old landmark—Alaric's grave, mayhap, or the course of the "dulce Galaesi flumen," to sketch the personality of the annalist Cassiodorus, or to relume some fading classic epithet in the light of present actuality. He is keenly alive, too, to the shifting beauty of sky and land and sea, and has an eye for the motley civilization of the native people around him whose splendor and squalor, gainful instincts, bright-colored costumes and grandiloquent manners call in turn for illustration. Every line of the book is instinct with the passion for that antique world which was the true fatherland of his soul. One feels how wholly true for him was the sentiment expressed in moralizing amid the broken columns of its immemorial temples:

"The stillness of a dead world lay its spell on all that lived. Today seemed an unreality, an idle impertinence; the real was that long-buried past which gave its meaning to all about me, touching the night with infinite pathos."

There lay all his heart-interests, condemned though he was to drudge hopelessly in the inconsequential present of modernity. Fittingly does he close his record with the words "As I looked my last toward the Ionian Sea, I wished it were mine to wander endlessly amid the silence of the ancient world, today and all its sounds forgotten."

FLORENCE MOYNIHAN.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Philosophy of Music, by Halbert Hains Britan, Ph. D.,
New York, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911. Pp. xiv + 252.

About the middle of the last century, Joseph L. d'Ortigue wrote a short essay on the subject "Philosophie de la Musique": it was a part of his "Introduction à l'Etude Comparée des Tonalités," and was reprinted in his "Dictionnaire de Plain-Chant et de Musique d'Eglise," one of the three hundred volumes of the Collection Migne. This essay was a fine attempt for that time, but perhaps too special, and intended to pave the way for deductions concerning archæological and liturgical, rather than modern and secular music.

Mr. Britan, on the contrary, envisages the music of our day just as it figures in modern society, applies to it the science of general and supreme principles, and boldly works out the solution of many problems raised by his new way of viewing old questions. The sincerity, loftiness, and clearness of his analysis make the work both instructive and enjoyable reading.

The first part of the book, *Introduction*, "states the problem," and then gives a fine sketch on Musical Form. The second part, *Psychological Analysis of the Elements of Music*, projects a new light on Rhythm, Melody, Harmony, and Musical Expression. The third part, properly the *Philosophy of Music*, deals with the Universality, Versatility, and Power of Music, the Content of Music, Musical Criticism, and Educational Value of Music. To go beyond mentioning the headings, or to point out some chapter as more attractive, would be aimless: scientific books of this kind, logically built up like mathematical treatises, have to be read *in extenso*, otherwise their full line of harmony cannot be duly appreciated.

Nevertheless, it will perhaps be opportune to mark two special points which may invite further inquiry and development: the first one, about rhythm; and the other one, about tonality, or rather modality.

I. According to Mr. Britan's conclusions, "the natural, instinctive effect of rhythm is emotional." This, of course, is said

of rhythm as it works in modern figured music, the music of the period duly called metric by some of our theorists: a rhythm "that must conform to the strictest requirements of mathematical relations"; a rhythm with isochronous pulsations and divisional symmetry. But this is not the only kind of rhythm recognized and logically practised. For, without taking into account the musical recitative, the "tempo rubato," the "a piacere," or even the very common tendency of many soloists to mitigate the rigid exactness of musical beats, we really have a world-wide system of essentially free rhythm, adopted more or less generally in all liturgies of all denominations. The most conspicuous exemplification of this free rhythm is the liturgical repertory of the Roman Catholic Church, called the Gregorian repertory. Even now, as much as ever, its use is in full vigor, and notable parts of it certainly were originated in the first centuries of Christianity, and its rhythmical spirit very likely was rooted in song worship of far distant times previous to the Christian era. Truly, it would be worth while, for a man fond of philosophic investigations, to acquire a thorough and genuine knowledge of the Gregorian rhythm, and then to try its psychological analysis.

II. Mr. Britan admits the difficulty of explaining the differential psychological effect of the major and minor modes. However, reasons of some kind had to be found for the character of *sadness* or *yearning* inherent in the minor triad. So, with Helmholtz, he suspects a kind of dissonance introduced by the fact of changing E into E flat in the triad C-E-G. Then, leaving Helmholtz, he joins Gurney, bringing to trial the minor scale itself, and finally supposes this scale to be more or less unnatural, whereas the major scale is taken as our normal musical standard. But neither argument seems to be conclusive.

In fact, 1° a minor triad is just as consonant as a major one. For, in relation to the normal starting-point, the rates of tone vibrations in the chord C-E-G are respectively 4, 5, 6, and the rates of the length of tubes or strings yielding such tones are respectively $1/4$, $1/5$, $1/6$; and, in relation to *another normal starting-point*, the rates of tone vibrations in the chord C-E flat-G, or A-C-E, are respectively $1/4$, $1/5$, $1/6$, and the rates of the length of tubes or strings are respectively 4, 5, 6. In both cases, nature herself secures material harmony based upon mathematical relations of tones. But, there is an inversion of elements, owing to

the inversion of the normal starting-point, as we shall see presently.

2°. Is the minor scale unnatural, or less natural than the major scale? *Our* minor scale, yes; the *real* and *normal* minor scale, no. Only we ought to know that the real minor scale is a mere major scale *upside-down*; and the same may be said of the harmonies congenial to both modes respectively.

The fact of our major scale being melodically and harmonically connected with, if not originated from, a phenomenon of resonance in ascending progression, which yields the elements of our major triad, is well known. But, how was the minor scale, with its usual harmony, originated? From a conventional imitation of the processes devised for the major scale, at least in so far as it was possible: accordingly, the minor triad, an element of rest as its symmetrical relative (or its *alter ego*) the major triad, was taken as a basis; from its root the minor scale started in an ascending direction, as in the major mode; in the same manner, the dominant was put by force on the fifth step, and, as the fifth and seventh above the said step were unable to play the same active and motive role as in major, owing to its dull minor third, this third was made constitutionally major by an alteration, which caused the scale to become undiatonic and unpopular; the remarkable harmonies of the fourth step, which gave birth to the noble plagal cadence, were overlooked, and the step itself became subservient to the fifth one; the third step lost its sonorous perfect triad; and so on. In truth, the whole minor system became a hybrid compound, an unnatural creation, on the pattern of which, however, numberless masterpieces have been written for centuries, thanks to the wonderful power of human genius.

Now, let us try the logical way. The ascending resonance, or system of overtones, moving on by successive multiplications of the number of vibrations and divisions of the length of sonorous strings or tubes, and taking C as the starting-point, will yield this series of tones: C, c, g, c', e', g', etc. Symmetrically, the descending resonance, or system of undertones, moving on by multiplications of lengths and divisions of vibrations, and taking e'' as the starting-point, will yield this other series: e'', e', a, e, c, A, etc. This new series gives us the elements of the minor triad in the same logical and mathematical way as the other one gives the elements of the major triad. Moreover, the inferior resonance delineates, always downwards, the normal minor scale, which is:

E-D-C-B = A-F-G-E, with its two descending tetrachords made out of tone + tone + semitone, symmetrical with those found in the major ascending direction. Furthermore, always in the descending direction, the first fifth of the minor scale gives the tonic triad A-C-E; and the second fifth gives the true dominant triad D-F-A, with addition, if desired, of a lower third B, symmetrical with the upper third F above the triad of G in C major. Whence we may infer incidentally that the true dominant of our usual minor scale ought to be the fourth step, instead of the fifth.

There are scores of symmetrical concordances between the major mode, as we have it, and the minor mode, as we should have it according to the present numerical statements. Countless books could be written on such matters. Composers should dream of them, and try to renovate our minor scale: there is a world of artistic "trouvailles" in that direction.

One of them might be a psychological analysis of the genuine modern harmonic modality. Let us hope Mr. Britan will write it some day.

ABEL L. GABERT.

Les Origines du Servage en France. Par Paul Allard. Paris, Victor Lecoffre. 1913. 12mo. Pp. 332.

This work may be regarded as supplementary to the same author's "Les Esclaves chrétiens depuis les premiers temps de l'Église jusqu'à la fin de la domination romaine en Occident." It is a study of the intermediate condition between slavery properly so called and liberty. The period dealt with runs from the middle of the fourth century to the end of the ninth. With great discrimination the author follows succinctly the various social, political and religious forces which operated during this period to bring about the change from personal to territorial restrictions on human liberty. A masterly analysis of the forces dominant in the social structure of the Roman Empire at the period of its decadence shows how the causes leading to the establishment of serfdom in Europe had placed limitations on the activities of all classes in society. The guarantees established by Roman legislators failed to have any efficacy in the time denominated by the author as the "Period of the Invasions," except in the estates of the churches

and the monasteries. In the second, or "Carolingian Period," these same guarantees are established universally, and the personal quality which made ancient slavery so obnoxious and repellant, entirely disappeared. The Capitularies of Charlemagne and the Records of the monasteries show how wide this divergence of social condition had become. An interesting chapter, with which the work concludes, is devoted to a discussion of the views prevailing in the ninth century regarding slavery. The work is a record of a profound social change, in which if progress was slow it was real and prepared the way for the subsequent period of universal emancipation.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Le Nouveau Psautier du Bréviaire Romain. Texte et Traduction avec notes succinctes. Par L. Cl. Fillion, Prêtre de Saint-Sulpice. Consulteur de la Commission Biblique. Paris, Victor Lecoffre. 1913. 12mo. Pp. viii + 531.

This work may be designated as a short commentary on the psalms arranged according to their liturgical order. Its practical purpose is that it brings out the logic in the new arrangement of the Psalterium and makes it possible for devout priests to enter more profoundly into the spirit of the daily office. There is a short introduction dealing with the Beauty and Importance of the Psalms, their Authorship, etc., and containing a list of the more difficult and obscure terms with their meanings. The Latin text and French translation (emended for the present edition) are placed in parallel columns, while copious notes and a short exposition accompany the text on each page.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Commodien: Recherches sur la Doctrine, la Langue, et le vocabulaire du Poète.

Les Instructions de Commodien: Traduction et Commentaire. Par Joachim Durel, Professeur au Lycée de Tunis. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1912. Pp. 320 and 210.

With commendable zeal M. Durel in these two painstaking and detailed studies aims at rescuing a little known Christian poet

from the uncertainty and obscurity with which history has surrounded him. It has been a truism among writers on the subject of early Christian literature that all the information we possess about Commodian is what his own works reveal.

Hitherto it was generally assumed, that, because he referred to himself as *Gazaecus*, he was a native of Gaza in Palestine. Durel leans to the other supposition and asserts with apparently good reasons that this epithet referred to his office (treasurer) rather than to his birth-place. The question of his nationality, his station and his family are, in the mind of the present author, matters beyond the ken of the historian. No such uncertainty, however, attaches to the date and place in which Commodian wrote. An analysis of the traditions of the North African church and the literary relationships and sources of Commodian is taken as convincing proof that the works of Commodian were written in Africa, by a disciple of St. Cyprian and that they date from the period between the persecution of Decius and the Edict of the Emperor Valerian (250 and 257). The greater part of the first volume is devoted to a minute examination of the linguistic characteristics of Commodian. Style, vocabulary, etc., leads the author to the general conclusion that the Latin of North Africa had distinctive characteristics, the most notable being its decidedly Hellenistic character, due to the predominant influence of Greek culture especially in the sea-coast towns. In bringing out the peculiarly African imprint in all the writings of Commodian, Forel has shown how close and unbroken was the tradition of the African Church through such writers as Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius and Lactantius. No attempt is made to exaggerate or overestimate the literary qualities or poetic merits of this rude African singer. He is presented as a devout and earnest disciple of Cyprian, aiming at giving expression in the unclassical language of his time to the profound truths and mysteries which had taken such deep root in his soul.

The second work is something more than a mere translation of the Instructions. It is an attempt to penetrate the meaning of the spirit which found in acrostics a suitable medium not only for apology but for propaganda and preaching. The obscurity of the language and the allusions which have repelled many readers. M. Durel seeks to clear up in his notes and commentaries. It would, perhaps, be too much to say that a definite and final

solution has been offered to the many questions which the name of Commodian suggests, but a new line of investigation has been opened up from which fruitful results may be expected.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Margaret's Travels: Letters from Margaret Lee, of New York, to Florence Jackson, of Chicago. By Anthony Yorke. P. J. Kennedy and Sons, New York, 1912. Pp. 254.

This book, dedicated to the National Order of the Daughters of Isabella, consists of forty-eight letters, in which one girl is supposed to give to another an account of a two months' European tour. Margaret, who wants to gain some flesh, and her sister Alice, who has fallen into a state of nervous prostration because her father will not allow her to become a nun, are suddenly sent off to see what will be the effect of a visit to foreign countries. Margaret seems to have been a rather naive traveller, for at the outset she tells us that, in addition to a letter of credit, she took with her some American gold, "which," she confidently adds, "circulates everywhere." She does not appear to have had occasion to use the gold on this journey, and it is a pity, for it would be interesting to know how she fared with it. The only gold coin that I know which is accepted nearly everywhere in Europe is the English sovereign; and even that has its limitations. On the whole, I think that the next time Margaret undertakes a tour, she had better buy travellers' cheques and leave out, if not the letter of credit, at least the gold.

The *Cedric* deposited the sisters and some fellow passengers on the tender at Queenstown, and anyone who has had a similar experience will have a fellow-feeling for them in the discomforts to which they were subjected by that operation and its *sequelae*. After some time agreeably spent in Cork and Blarney, Glengariff and Killarney, we are taken on to Dublin, which is sympathetically and pleasantly described. Margaret, however, is somewhat rocky in her history and decidedly mixed as to her facts. For instance, she tells us that Trinity College, Dublin, was originally founded by the Catholic Church! and that Christ Church Cathedral contains the tombs of Swift and Stella!! Such an unauthorised transference of his remains from the great Cathedral of St. Patrick, of

which he was an ornament for thirty-two years, is enough to make the Dean's body turn in his grave and to excite his spirit to that *saeva indignatio* which was its distinguishing characteristic in life. To make amends for her distortion of history, Margaret pays a deserved compliment to the accent of the Dublin people.

In speaking of a visit to Powerscourt waterfall, she makes the extraordinary statement that a fox-hunt was going on in the vicinity at the time. A fox-hunt in Ireland in midsummer! Why, the very thought is a desecration. Some county Wicklow joker must have been fooling Margaret.

Full justice is done to Glendalough and St. Kevin's Bed, but the Vale of Avoca and the Meeting of the Waters prove disappointing to our tourists, as they have done to so many others.

On their way to the north of Ireland Margaret's party, now increased by Mr. Jack Lawlor, of San Francisco, and his mother, lose their trunks, and they are stranded in Cavan until the missing baggage eventually turns up. Belfast is found to be up to expectations. The staircase of its City Hall is lauded as the fairest they ever saw with the exception of the one in the Library of Congress at Washington. There is naturally a good deal said about the Giant's Causeway and Finn Mac Cumhail, or, as Margaret phonetically spells it, Fin McCool.

In London, Margaret is fairly bewildered. She regrets in particular that she had not previously learned enough of architecture to know the difference between Corinthian, Doric, and Ionic columns, to discriminate between the Renaissance, Byzantine, and Gothic styles, or to be able to assign to Sir Christopher Wren, Inigo Jones, or Pugin his proper place. But she likes "this old town," as she calls the world's metropolis, and she admits that the Strand is "a busy street," while patriotically quarrelling with Johnson's dictum that "the full tide of human existence is at Charing Cross." She naturally gives the preference for the location of that interesting spot to the corner of Broadway and Forty-Second Street. Trafalgar Square, Whitehall, Old Scotland Yard, the Horse Guards, Downing Street, the Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey, the Tower, the British Museum, Hyde Park, the National Gallery, Westminster Catholic Cathedral, Brompton Oratory, Buckingham Palace, and Hampton Court are all breezily passed in review. It is a pleasure to note the impressions each of those well-known landmarks produced on one who is supposed

to be seeing them for the first time, and the art of the writer is here conspicuously displayed. A very delightful chapter headed "Literary Shrines," is chiefly concerned with Shakespeare, Spenser, Beaumont, Fletcher, Ben Jonson, Milton, Herrick, Crashaw, Lovelace, Steele, Addison, Samuel Johnson, Boswell, Goldsmith, Fielding, Lamb, Keats, Thackeray, Dickens, and Praed, and many bits of out of the way literary gossip are cleverly worked in.

The scene is next transferred to Paris, where the usual show-sights are run over rapidly and interestingly. Then, after a day spent at Fontainebleau, we are whisked to Lucerne, Como, Milan, Venice, Florence, and Rome. At Rome a long stay is made, and vivid and appealing descriptions of some of its more noted glories are given. Next in order are visited Naples, Pisa, Genoa, Nice, Monte Carlo, Marseilles, Paris again, and Versailles. Then Cherbourg, where the travellers embark for New Lork.

Of course, Jack Lawlor and Margaret fall in love with each other, and become engaged; and, also of course, Alice's father withdraws his objections to his daughter's becoming a nun. So, everything ends happily for everyone concerned.

Margaret's Travels, despite a few trivial slips such as I have pointed out, is a very entertaining book, and will well repay perusal. That part of it which deals with Rome is particularly pleasing and at the same time instructive. The character of the narrator is well sustained throughout, and the style of the letters is quite natural and just what might be expected in one girl's correspondence with another.

The book is splendidly printed, bound, and turned out by P. J. Kennedy and Sons, and contains many handsome photographic illustrations.

P. J. LENNOX.

Kurzgefasste Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch mit Berücksichtigung der Ergebnisse der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft und der Koine-Forschung. Von A. T. Robertson. Deutsche Ausgabe von Hermann Stocks. Leipzig, Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911. 5 marks.

Nowadays there is no question that linguistic studies are of the highest importance for a thorough understanding of Holy Writ.

If this is true generally speaking, it is especially true in regard to the New Testament Greek. The knowledge of Classical Greek is not at all sufficient, what has to be added, necessarily added, is the exact study of the so-called Hellenistic Greek as it was used by popular writers and scribes outside of Greece. The last century yielded an enormous mass of such new material. Papyri, Inscriptions and Ostraca, containing in the daily life language notices on daily life subjects as contracts, letters, bills, short notices, etc. All this, studied and sifted, will be of the greatest profit for the right understanding of the Sacred Writers.

Mr. A. T. Robinson, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Ky., has made very successful use of all this raw material in his study of the Greek language of the New Testament. His study, of which a third edition has appeared, has been translated into German, enlarged and in some points corrected by Mr. Hermann Stocks. It gives in its first part a sufficient statement of the general questions regarding the New Testament Greek (pp. 1-14). The second part contains the special study of the same: spelling, pronunciation, declensions and conjugations (pp. 14-98). The third part is without doubt the most useful and important. Extending over almost 200 pages (pp. 98-269) it covers the whole syntax in its different parts, the syntax of the nouns and pronouns, the prepositions, the verb, its moods, genders and tenses, the syntax of the different kinds of phrases and the particles. The first appendix gives a very good indication of the rich literature on the Greek related to the New Testament: sources, grammars and dictionaries, the literature of the Koine and the New Testament; the second appendix contains a collection of passages of the whole Bible spoken of in some way or another in the book.

Robertson's study on New Testament Greek has been highly praised by the critics and, let us add, fully deserves it. Language and method are clear, its research is solid, its contents sufficiently complete. Of course a book of 312 pages can not possibly exhaust the enormous amount of material to be treated of or the great number of questions to be answered; there will always be found some *lacunae*, for as the translator says in his preface, "a grammar will never be finished"; nevertheless nobody who uses this book for condensed information, will put it aside without real profit and satisfaction.

FRANZ J. COELN.

Das Buch Kohelet. Von Vinzenz Zapletal. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Fleiburg i. B., Herder, 1911. 4.80 Marks.

Rev. F. Zapletal's Kohelet consists of two main parts, the Introduction p. 3-91 and the Commentary p. 91-236. The Introduction offers a very good survey of the different ideas which have been maintained on the Kohelet, especially in the last century. In reviewing them the author goes into every difficulty with earnestness. That his attempts are not always as successful as might be desired, is not his fault, but is due to the highly enigmatic character of this strange book. His conclusions seem nevertheless to be solid and mature, though of course not decisive. He proves that the author can not possibly have been Solomon, because the author has at least some indirect knowledge of later Greek philosophy. For this reason on one hand, and on the other hand on account of his being earlier than the writers of the book of the Proverbs and the Ecclesiasticus, the date of the Kohelet is given as the third century B. C. F. Zapletal's statements concerning Kohelet's belief regarding the immortality of the soul seem to be well founded, though it can not be said that every difficulty or uncertainty is quite removed. The exegesis of the Hebrew text is simple, but sufficient, and excels in references to Greek and Latin writers. His conjectures on text emendations, however, are not always beyond doubt as their foundation, the supposed metrical system, is not recognized as safe. The diction is good. Striking, however, is the frequent use of the personal pronoun *ich* and *wir*, since the German scientific language prefers to make exclusive use of its many possibilities of impersonal expression.

FRANZ J. COELN.

Les Actes Apocryphes de l'Apotre André; les Actes d'André et de Mathias, de Pierre et d'André et les textes apparentés. Par J. Flamion. Louvain, Beuraux du Recueil, Namur 40, 1911.

In the literature of early Christianity, quite naturally a great deal of pious fiction arose, dealing with religious persons, doctrines and facts which were of the highest interest to all Christians. Thus find very many apocryphal writings which, though originating

centuries after the death of the Apostles, have been attributed to or connected with them and therefore gained high authority among the faithful. Suffice it to recall only the several redactions of the *Canones Apostolorum*, the letter of St. Peter to Clemens, the *Didascaleia* and others which even now are regarded in the oriental churches as genuine and became therefore the basis of later and even modern ecclesiastical legislation in the Orient. The awakening of the critical spirit through the works of Lipsius, Hennecke Schmidt, Delahaye and others helped to attribute to this old novelistic literature its right place as a literature not to be trusted, but nevertheless helpful for research in the study of early Christianity.

Rev. F. Flamion studies in his book, the apocryphal Acts of the Apostle Andrew, one of the most interesting of these early works of fiction. In the first part of his work he groups and reviews the different texts: texts from the Orient, such as the *Martyrium Andreae Alterum*, the *Martyrium Andreae Prius*, the so-called *Narratio* and the Byzantine remains of the *Gesta Andreae*, and texts from the Occident, such as the letter of the Priests and Deacons of Achaja, the Latin *Passio Sti Andreae* and Gregory of Tours' book of the Miracles of the Apostle Andrew. In the second part he carries on exact research work on the primitive texts of St. Andrew according to the texts *Passio*, *Gesta*, Gregory's legendary report. He makes it at least very plausible that the primitive Acts of St. Andrew originated in Achaja at the time of the Neo-Platonists, more exactly the second half of the third century. The third part treats of the Acts of St. Andrew and related writings which are independent of the primitive Acts spoken of in the second part. Valuable additions to the book are the geographical and historical Indices.

The book deserves a warm recommendation. Every page in it offers clear proofs that the learned author has mastered the vast literature of his branch not only in French, but also in other languages, English, German, Italian and Latin. His statements are clear, his deductions safe, his diction interesting. In all, his work will do honor to his scholarship and form a creditable part of the *Recueil de Travaux* of the University of Louvain.

FRANZ J. COELN.

Die Allegorie des Hohen Liedes. Von Romuald Munz. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1912.

The title of the book "allegorie" is significant. The author holds to the traditional concept of the Song of Songs and rejects therefore the modern explanation according to which the Song of Songs is nothing else than a collection of profane songs (either of single wedding songs or a wedding drama). He likewise disproves the idea of some exegetes who concede the allegorical meaning and aim of the song, but suppose a certain profane fact or so as basis for the Song and its allegorisation; he insists that the Song of Songs is only and exclusively an allegory, using the highest natural love to show the character and destinies of the supernatural love.

According to him the Song of Songs is to be divided into two parts: the first part of which (Chapt. 1, 1-5, 1) pictures the wooing of the Bridegroom (God) for the Bride (mankind). In this part (ch. 1, 2-2, 7) shows how the Bride begins to love and how God as Bridegroom promises to retake Mankind as Bride to his love and to confer on them the divine Filiation. Ch. 2, 8-3, 5 contain the foundation and history of the old Testament in which God is dealing with mankind through the elected people, and ch. 3, 6-5, 1 the first spiritual espousals of God with mankind through His Incarnation. The second part (ch. 5, 2-6, 10) treats of the life of mankind in the New Testament Church. Ch. 5, 2-6, 10 contain the sufferings of the Bride (Church), ch. 6, 11-8, 4, her rejoicings and ch. 8, 5-14, the second and final espousals of God with the Elects in Heaven, the bringing home of the Bride and eternal union in the heavenly kingdom.

In the commentary the author gives first the Hebrew text with a German translation, then a short grammatical and critical explanation and finally the allegorical commentary. He deserves credit that he does not base his critical explanation on the supposition of a more or less probable (or improbable) Hebrew *metrum* and *rhythmus*. The allegorical explanation is and must naturally be extremely subjective and thus not suiting everybody's taste. It has, however, to be conceded that the author devoted as much care and love as possible to this part. The language of the Rev. author is beautiful and refined and his thoughts are full

of *esprit* and noble wit. It is therefore only natural that his book should find many readers and devout friends.

FRANZ J. COELN.

Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum, Auctore Francisco Zorell.
Cursus Scripturae Sacrae, auctoribus Cornely, Knabenbauer,
de Hummelauer aliisque Soc. Jesu presbyteris. Paris, Le-
thielleux, 1911-1912.

This Lexicon consists of four fascicules, three of which were available for review. Everyone knows that a dictionary of the New Testament is a work not only of great importance, but of considerable difficulty as well. Hence the Rev. F. Zorell deserves the thanks of Scripture students for his lexicon, which, judging from the three fascicules, will prove very helpful for exegetical purposes. It is clear and reliable and, notwithstanding its conciseness, remarkably rich and complete. Of course, there remain some points and details that might be changed in a subsequent edition. For instance, the appearance and usefulness of the book would be improved by the use of types of different sizes; a larger type for the main body and a smaller one for the philological, literary and historical notes, which should be more extensive; for the richer they are the greater the benefit which the reader will derive. Again it would be most useful and interesting, not to say necessary, to give under each principal word its synonyms and antonyms with a brief comparison of their meanings and uses and to indicate as far as possible the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents corresponding in the Septuagint and the other Greek versions. We confess that it is no easy task to keep to a middle course in these additional matters, but we think that fuller completeness in the direction we have pointed out would be appreciated by those students who, after their elementary biblical course, go on to deeper philological and critical studies in Holy Writ. But even now F. Zorell's Lexicon will be to them of the greatest service, as well as any other similar dictionary and in some points even more.

FRANZ J. COELN.

MISCELLANEOUS.

National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.

The Catholic women of the United States are taking a very lively interest in the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception that it is proposed to build on the grounds of the Catholic University. Large associations have been already formed at Washington, New York and Baltimore under the name of the National Organization of Catholic Women, for the purpose of building to the honor of Mary Immaculate a most beautiful shrine at the National Capital. Already ten thousand dollars have been contributed, mostly in small sums, from ten cents to a dollar, and it seems certain that by a nation-wide participation the holy enterprise will be successful. From one lady, who desires to remain anonymous, was received a contribution of five hundred dollars. Many of the letters concerning the Shrine betray great joy that a public monument of this nature should be built at Washington in honor of the Immaculate Conception, to which not only the University but the whole Catholic people are solemnly consecrated. Many bishops and priests have signified their cordial approval, and from some parishes have already been sent in modest contributions, the voluntary offering of priest and people.

The great Shrines of Our Lady in Europe, described by Canon Northcote in his "Celebrated Sanctuaries of the Madonna" were due to popular enthusiasm for the Mother of Jesus Christ, and in their construction brought out a multitude of virtues, while they fed habitually the faith and hope of entire nations. Whoever has seen the touching scenes in the wonderful Shrine of Lourdes or in that of Fourvieres at Lyons easily forecasts the influence for good that a lovely Shrine of Our Beloved Mother at Washington would exercise.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific the name of Mary is pronounced in humble and loving veneration, and for over four centuries has been the comfort and consolation of countless millions in the New World. Every State and town, every diocese and parish, is in many ways her debtor. The whole American land, mountain and

valley, river and lake, rejoices in some form of her name, and there seems, therefore, a peculiar fitness in the creation of one beautiful Church that will forever stand as the expression of Catholic American gratitude, and also entirely the tribute of all the arts through eminent exponents of their charm and force.

The churches of Catholicism, scattered the world over, are so many havens of spiritual rest, incomparable schools of the highest religious thought, and sources of the purest Christian life. In these churches Mary has usually her own altar, her own devotions, and exercises her own peculiar ministry of comfort and counsel, her own sweet office of refuge of sinners, health of the sick and comforter of the afflicted.

In her own great and beautiful shrine we may hope to experience a very special out-pouring of those graces that her Divine Son never fails to grant at the request of His Mother. Amid the splendors of architecture, painting and sculpture, the voice of this holy shrine will one day be heard, through orator and musician, in every part of our broad land. Indeed, every part of the church will be made to declare the honor and glory of Mary Immaculate, proclaim her praise and her merits, and invoke her intercourse and succor. The sanctity and the goodness of Mary will find in this monumental church broad spaces on which, in many charming ways, their influence will be exhibited, while the ingenuity of love will surely add new features distinctive of this Shrine above all others.

Contributions to the National Shrine may be made in any sums from ten cents upwards, and may be sent to Miss Fannie Whelan, 1717 20th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. F. B. Hoffman, 58 East 79th St., New York City; or to the Rector of the University. Collectors can obtain from the aforementioned ladies, books of ten dollars or one hundred dollars, and it is hoped that many will voluntarily solicit the honor of aiding in the creation of the National Shrine. The names of deceased relatives or friends may be inscribed, and the holy sacrifice of the Mass is offered on Mondays and Saturdays for all benefactors.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

The Rector's Prize Debate. Perhaps the best prepared and best presented debate ever heard at the Catholic University was that held Wednesday evening, April 9th, in the contest for the Rector's prize. The Rector's prize debate is an annual event in the program of the Shahan Debating Society. The prize awarded to the winning side is that presented by the Rt. Rev. Rector, Monsignor Shahan—three gold "Catholic University" medals, of special design, and made up in the form of watch fobs. They are of exquisite taste, and are much coveted.

The question debated read: "Resolved: That any trust or industrial combination large enough to be the dominant factor in its branch of production should be prohibited by Federal legislation." The contestants were: Mr. Edward Stanton, Law '15, Tennessee; Mr. Charles Lacey McClaskey, Law '14, Kentucky; Mr. Eugene M. Dwyer, Sc. '13, New York, on the affirmative side; and Mr. William C. Walsh, Law '13, Maryland; Mr. John J. Burke, Law '14, Connecticut; Mr. Stephen E. Hurley, Law '14, North Dakota, on the negative side. Mr. Walsh took up the rebuttal argument for the negative side, and Mr. McClaskey, the rebuttal for the affirmative. The debaters all showed a good understanding of the question, and all gave evidence of possessing powers of eloquent and forceful delivery. The Debating Society is to be congratulated upon the presentation of such an interesting and entertaining performance. The decision of the judges was given in favor of the affirmative side, Messrs. Stanton, McClaskey and Dwyer.

The Debating Society and the University were signally honored in the personnel of the judges—the Hon. John Burke, Treasurer of the United States, the Hon. Thos. J. Walsh, United States Senator, Montana, and Hon. Lawrence O. Murray, Comptroller of the Currency. Mr. Murray is an alumnus of the University. Whether or not the judges differed in their individual decisions upon the issue of the debate, they were

unanimous and unstinting in pronouncing the discussion a most creditable one.

The meeting was presided over by the President of the Society, Mr. Denis M. McDonough, New Hampshire, who made a few appropriate remarks and introduced the various speakers. The program was interspersed with instrumental music, rendered by the Messrs. Grant, Touart and Grant. The University Quartette, Rev. G. A. Gleason, Rev. J. W. Warren, Messrs. Ryan and Crolly, enlivened the entertainment with amusing vocal selections which called forth repeated and prolonged applause.

The contestants in the Rector's prize debate, 1913, have set a standard which their successors will not easily surpass; and the entire evening's entertainment gives assurance of conspicuous interest attaching to any future presentation of the Shahan Debating Society.

The Alumni Association. The eighteenth annual meeting of the Alumni Association of the Catholic University of America was held in Philadelphia on April 25. It was the most successful and enjoyable meeting in the history of the Association. The Alumni of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia extended a hospitality which it would be difficult indeed to excel. The meeting and the banquet which followed were held at the Bellevue-Stratford.

The members were particularly delighted with brief addresses by His Grace Archbishop Prendergast, and by the Hon. Charles Joseph Bonaparte, who represented the Board of Trustees. Mgr. Shahan gave a satisfactory account of the achievements of the University during the past academic year and outlined some of its pressing needs. He laid particular stress on the need of enlarging our academic spaces and dormitory accommodations so as to take care of the large number of students who are now overcrowding all our University buildings. The toast "Our Alumni" was responded to by the Right Reverend Chancellor of the Archdiocese, Mgr. Charles J. Kavanagh. In listening to his discourse the Alumni were filled with gratitude

for the privilege that was theirs and renewed their resolve to do still greater credit to their Alma Mater in the years of labor that await them.

Rev. B. A. McKenna, the historian of the Association, read a paper at the afternoon session which will interest the Alumni of the University throughout the country and all the well-wishers and promoters of Catholic education. After extending to the visitors a hearty welcome from the local Alumni and from the diocese, Father McKenna continued:

"And after having bid you welcome, we wish to sound a note of thanks, thanks to our Holy Father with whom we sympathize in his present illness, for the great interest he has taken in this, his University of America. It is not an ordinary University, but a Papal University. Its inception by the late Leo XIII, the approval of its constitution and statutes on March 7, 1889, and the empowering the University to grant the usual degrees of a Pontifical institution, made him its founder and protector.

"And after his demise, our beloved Pontiff, Pius X, has given untiring interest to all that concerned the Catholic University of America. On the eve of the Epiphany, 1912, from St. Peter's in Rome, came forth a letter which made it clear that the University was a creation of the Holy See, and that the Pope was bent on making its growth vigorous. In this letter of Pius X to Cardinal Gibbons we find the following words: 'For we clearly understand how much a Catholic University of high repute and influence can do towards spreading and upholding the Catholic Doctrine and furthering the cause of civilization. To protect it, therefore, and to quicken its growth, is, in our judgment, equivalent to rendering the most valuable service to religion and country alike.'"

Commenting on this letter Dr. Pace says: "It was never intended that the University should be detached from the other elements of our educational system or that it should passively and patiently await the gradual improvement of the preparatory schools as the condition of its own development. On the contrary, as Leo XIII repeatedly declared and as Pius X now

reiterates in the plainest possible terms, the University is to be the center and source of vitality for all our institutions."

We congratulate our Alma Mater on the great work she has done during the past years and particularly during this past year. Following the wish and decree of Leo XIII, she provides instruction in every department of learning that both the clergy and laity, alike, may have an opportunity to satisfy their laudable desire for knowledge.

We congratulate the Chancellor of the University, Cardinal Gibbons, for his untiring zeal on its behalf; we congratulate the Board of Trustees for their work in its interest; we congratulate our beloved Rector, Monsignor Shahan, who has ever done much to further the great interest of the Catholic University; we congratulate professors and scholars.

Active work has been done during the past year; high schools and colleges have been affiliated with the University; the National Congress of Charities has spent days in its halls for the good of mankind; and in all movements that would be of great importance for the furtherance of education and of morality, our Alma Mater has taken her due part. Nor has this been only in a slight degree. Her influence has been nation-wide and has left its impress, not only on Catholic minds, but on all the citizens of our vast republic.

We all knew of the high ideals of our Alma Mater. We were all aware of the grand work of which she was capable; we knew the times of stress and discouragement which filled some of her years; but now we rejoice to see her, not only accomplishing the purpose originally appointed for her, but even stretching out toward other works in the educational line which, at first, were thought of only remotely, but which have now become an actuality. We refer to the Sisters College.

The Sisters College, which was opened in 1911, responded to a need long felt; and its results amply justify the great undertaking. It will unify the Catholic school system in the United States and its importance and influence will in time be more far-reaching than that of any other work established by the Church in this country for the furtherance of elementary

education. As was expressed in the resolutions of the Catholic Educational Association at Pittsburgh, June, 1912: "We are confident that it will exercise a most beneficent influence on the future of our Catholic elementary school system."

We recall the spirit of pride with which we saw the Sisters receive their degrees from the University. It was the first time in four hundred years that degrees had been conferred on women by a Pontifical institution. They were proud of the honor and went forth not only to voice their gratitude for the opportunities afforded them at this Papal institution, but also to make their influence felt in its behalf. And, as Cardinal Gibbons says, "In this way the benefits of the University are soon brought home to the remotest parish in our country, and not only the sons of our Catholic people, but their consecrated daughters, can drink at the fountain of knowledge which the popular generosity has opened and sustained."¹

Colleges and High Schools Affiliated with the University. The following-named colleges and high schools, having complied with all the requirements for affiliation, have been duly affiliated. Other institutions are now under consideration by the Committee on Affiliation. The *Bulletin* will publish from time to time all additions to the list of affiliated educational institutions.

COLLEGES

Trinity College, Washington, D. C. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.

Saint Clara College, Sinsinawa, Wisconsin. Conducted by the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic.

Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana. Conducted by the Sisters of Providence.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Academy of Notre Dame, Lowell, Mass. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.

¹ Cardinal's Letter for Collection for the University, Nov. 3, 1912.

- Academy of Notre Dame, West Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pa. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Academy of Notre Dame, Roxbury, Mass. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Boston Academy of Notre Dame, 204 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- College of Notre Dame, San Francisco, Cal. (Academy only). Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- College of Notre Dame, San Jose, Cal. (Academy only). Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Holy Angels' Academy, Milwaukee, Wis. Conducted by the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
- Holy Rosary High School, Pittsburg, Pa. Conducted by Holy Rosary Parish.
- Loretto Academy, Kansas City, Mo. Conducted by the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross.
- Mount Notre Dame High School, Reading, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, Mt. St. Joseph, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Charity.
- Mount Saint Vincent Academy, Price Hill, Cincinnati, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Charity.
- Mount Saint Mary's Seminary, Scranton, Pa. Conducted by the Sister-Servants of the Immaculate Heart.
- Notre Dame Academy, Grandin Road, Cincinnati, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Notre Dame Academy, Hamilton, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Notre Dame Academy, Court Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Notre Dame Academy, Waterbury, Conn. Conducted by the Sisters of the Congregation de Notre Dame.
- Notre Dame Academy, East Sixth Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Notre Dame Academy, Dayton, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Notre Dame High School, San Jose, Cal. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Our Lady of the Lake (Academy), San Antonio, Texas. Conducted by the Sisters of Divine Providence.

- Saint Ambrose High School, Ironwood, Mich. Conducted by Saint Ambrose Parish.
- Saint Clara Academy, Sinsinawa, Wis. Conducted by the Sisters of the Third Order of Saint Dominic.
- Saint Joseph's Academy, Columbus, Ohio. Conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.
- Saint Joseph's Academy, Greensburg, Pa. Conducted by the Sisters of Charity.
- Saint Joseph's Academy, St. Louis, Mo. Conducted by the Sisters of Saint Joseph.
- Saint Mary's Academy, Denver, Colo. Conducted by the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross.
- Saint Mary's Academy, Portland, Oregon. Conducted by the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary.
- Saint Mary-of-the-Woods Academy, Indiana. Conducted by the Sisters of Providence.
- Saint Mary's College and Academy, Monroe, Mich. (Academy only). Conducted by the Sister-Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.
- Ursuline Academy, Cleveland, Ohio. Conducted by the Ursuline Sisters.
- Ursuline Academy, Villa Angela, Nottingham, Ohio. Conducted by the Ursuline Sisters.
- Villa Sancta Scholastica, Duluth, Minn. (Academy only). Conducted by the Sisters of Saint Benedict.